1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	DISTRICT OF NEVADA BEFORE THE HONORABLE LARRY R. HICKS, SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE000	
3	6	506
4	ORACLE USA, INC., et al,	:
5	Plaintiffs,	: : No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-VCF
6	-vs-	: September 28, 2021
7	RIMINI STREET, INC., et al,	: Reno, Nevada
8	Defendants.	: Volume 7
9		_:
10		
11	TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING	
12		
13	APPEARANCES:	
14	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Rich	ard J. Pocker amin P. Smith
15	Will	iam A. Isaacson ica Phillips
16	Shar	on R. Smith y Houmand
17	Zach	ary Hill rneys at Law
18		
19	FOR THE DEFENDANTS: W. West Allen Eric Vandevelde	
20	Samu	el G. Liversidge sa Samplin
21	Case	y J. McCracken rneys at Law
22		_
23		aret E. Griener, CCR #3, FCRR cial Reporter
24	400	South Virginia Street , Nevada 89501
25		

```
RENO, NEVADA, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2021, 9:00 A.M.
 1
 2
                                ---000---
 3
 4
                   THE COURT: Good morning.
 5
                   Have a seat, please.
 6
                   All right. The record will show that we're
 7
     reconvened on Tuesday morning, September 28th.
 8
                   This is our seventh day of trial, and I would
 9
     expect that the evidence would be finished today, but, in any
10
     event, we're in the course of the examination this morning of
11
     Mr. Lanchak by Mr. Liversidge.
12
                   You're welcome to go forward.
13
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: Thank you, your Honor.
14
     Good morning.
15
                   Good morning, Mr. Lanchak.
16
                   THE WITNESS: Good morning.
17
                             STEPHEN LANCHAK,
           recalled as a witness on behalf of the Defendant,
18
            previously sworn, testified further as follows:
19
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION RESUMED
20
     BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
21
          When we finished yesterday we were talking about the use
2.2
     of open code in providing updates for JD Edwards software, and
23
     you mentioned that open code is modified at every stage of the
24
     software's lifecycle. I'd like start by focusing on the
25
     maintenance and support phase of the product life cycle.
```

1 MR. LIVERSIDGE: And if we could go to the next 2 slide in our slide deck, which is DDX-708.

## BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:

2.2

- Q Now, Mr. Lanchak, can you walk us through what is reflected on this slide.
- A Yes. From a support and maintenance perspective, what we have here -- and I'll go from left to right -- is -- let's say in course of normally conducting your business there are tax law changes, and we've seen some of these already in terms of year-end changes, like 1099 changes, W2 changes.

But there are also larger changes that happen, you know, on occasion. For instance, in the past we've had the Affordable Care Act, and, with what's being discussed in Washington, who knows. I mean, Washington, D.C., might become the 51st state. That's an example of some major changes that would need to be made for these applications in the open layer of the code.

But then you have other things that may be related to the company's business strategy, for instance, they're expanding globally which means they would need to add to their chart of accounts, add new accounts.

Those new accounts might require additional business functions that would need to be coded within the open layer of the code to accommodate this new region that they're operating in.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And, then, you know, other changes, for example, a new distributor is added, and that new distributor may have new or different processing requirements, functionality requirements, that are necessary, and that would be a change to the open code to add that new distributor and the business functions associated with their work. And then, lastly, I mean, innovation happens all the time, new products are being added. A new product is added, and there may -- there would likely be new vendors associated with the manufacture of that new product, and there, again, may be additional business functions that need to be coded into the open accessible layer to accommodate, you know, that change. So that's a quick high level summary of the types of maintenance and support events that you may have to contend with. And, Mr. Lanchak, do you have an understanding of whether Rimini assists customers with the types of updates you have just described in this slide? Yes, they do --MR. HILL: Objection, foundation, your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. I think some greater foundation is necessary here. BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: Mr. Lanchak, as part of your work in this case, did you

- review the materials that the parties produced in deposition
  testimony and interrogatory responses?
  - A I reviewed lots of documentation regarding what Rimini does with regard to maintenance and support operations.
    - Q And have you sat through various parts of the testimony during this proceeding?
- 7 A **I have.**

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q And based on your review of the materials and your understanding of the testimony, do you believe you have a general understanding of the types of support that Rimini provides to its customers?
- 12 A Yes, I do have a general understanding of the types of support that Rimini provides to its customer base.
  - Q Based on that, do you have an understanding of whether Rimini assists customers with the types of updates that you have described in this slide?
  - A Yes. As a third-party maintenance and support provider,
    Rimini would do this kind of work for their clients.
    - Q And when you were working as a third-party support provider yourself, did you modify and copy the open code in supporting JDE along the lines described in this slide?
- 22 A I did.
- 23 Q Now, we've talked about it a little bit, but what is the purpose of the tool image in this slide?
- 25 A Well, the tools -- I think I may have spoken about this

yesterday a little bit, too -- are provided by the software vendor, JD Edwards, Oracle, to facilitate the access and modification and copying of the code in that open layer to bring about these changes that you need to be responsive to your business environment, your regulatory environment, et cetera.

And these tools, you know, essentially, support the -- tools like Object Management Workbench in particular support your ability to go in and create new code objects, modify existing code objects, and properly promote those objects through the various environments.

There's also another tool, too, that we haven't spoken about yet that is called event rule language, which is a tool that enables the user to actually create code without programming it. It's called programmerless programming is the slogan that's been used with it.

And it essentially is a tool that allows -- through point and click allows the user to create code, and it also uses wizards to aid the user in creating that code.

It's great for simple business functions. For the more complex business functions usually you have to go into the native C and do those C code and do those directly.

- Q And are these tools that are provided used to implement tax and regulatory updates into the JDE open code software?
- 25 A They are.

2.2

- 1 Q Mr. Lanchak, do you recall hearing testimony from
- 2 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross regarding Rimini's use of the JDE tools?
- 3 | A I do.
- 4 MR. LIVERSIDGE: Let's pull up slide 37, if we
- 5 | could, from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's slide deck.
- 6 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
- 7 Q Mr. Lanchak, do you recall seeing this slide?
- 8 | A I do.
- 9 Q And what is your understanding of Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's
- 10 | contention in connection with this slide?
- 11 A Well, essentially that it would be unlawful to use Object
- 12 Management Workbench to work with the JD Edwards code.
- 13 Q And what is your reaction to Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's
- 14 | contention that it is illegal to use the tools that Oracle
- 15 | provides to modify the open code?
- 16 A It makes absolutely no sense that the software vendor
- would provide tools for you, encourage your use of those
- 18 tools, facilitate your ability to use these tools to modify
- 19 the code, and then say it's illegal to use these tools. It
- 20 | just flies in the face of common sense.
- 21 Q Did you use these tools when you were working with JDE
- 22 products?
- 23 A Yes, we did.
- 24 Q And is it your understanding that Rimini uses these
- 25 tools?

- A Yes. That is my understanding.
- 2 Q In your experience, do other companies use these tools?
- 3 A Yes, they do.

- 4 Q Which types of companies are you referring to?
- 5 A Well, you have the direct competitors of Rimini, such as
- 6 | Spinnaker and Support Revolution, but then you also have the
- 7 | whole -- the rest of the ecosystem, including the application
- 8 | support and maintenance providers, the systems integrators,
- 9 you know, companies that -- like IBM, Accenture, Capgemini,
- Deloitte, PWC, Tata, Infosys, HCL. It's quite a long list.
- 11 Q And how about smaller firms, like mom-and-pop shops, do
- 12 | they use the tools as well?
- 13 A Yes, they do. So, you know, there was some testimony
- 14 | yesterday about SpearMC. That's a medium-sized company that
- 15 uses these tools. ERP Suites is another example of a smaller
- 16 JD Edwards integrator and support provider that uses the
- 17 tools.
- 18 And then you have, as I mentioned yesterday,
- 19 innumerable LLCs, you know, with a handful of people, that use
- 20 these tools in service of their customers.
- 21 And then, of course, as I said yesterday, too, the
- 22 | independent third-party contractors, individuals, that hire
- 23 | themselves out to work, you know, in a support and maintenance
- 24 | capacity, or to work on a project, utilize these tools.
- 25 | Q Now, Mr. Lanchak, you've testified that you've worked in

- 1 | the industry for three decades; is that correct?
- 2 A That's correct.
- 3 Q And you had 18 years of working exclusively with Oracle
- 4 products; is that right?
- 5 A That's correct.
- 6 Q And you also testified that you were a trusted adviser
- 7 | for over 60 senior IT executives, including CIOs and CTOs; is
- 8 | that right?
- 9 A That is right.
- 10 Q And in the course of that work, you had many meetings
- 11 | with Oracle in connection with these engagements; is that
- 12 correct?
- 13 | A **I did.**
- 14 Q And based on that experience during your work in the
- 15 Oracle Enterprise software industry, did you ever have any
- reason to believe that it would be unlawful to modify and copy
- JDE open code using these Oracle-provided tools?
- 18 A None whatsoever. In all the meetings that I've had with
- 19 Oracle, with clients individually, innumerable meetings,
- 20 | countless meetings, this was never even, you know,
- 21 conceivable.
- 22 Q Did anyone ever express to you that it would be unlawful
- 23 to modify and copy JDE open code using these tools?
- 24 A No.
- MR. HILL: Objection, hearsay.

I'll allow the answer based on his 1 THE COURT: 2 experience. 3 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: Have you ever seen any industry documents suggesting that 4 5 modifying and copying open code is unlawful? 6 No, I have not. 7 In your opinion, from an industry perspective, would it 8 be reasonable to conclude that it may be unlawful to work with 9 these Oracle-provided tools? No, I wouldn't conclude that it is unlawful to work with 10 11 these tools. 12 Now, do you recall Ms. Frederiksen-Cross also testifying 13 that displaying this JDE open code was a violation of the 14 injunction? 15 Yes, I do remember that. 16 MR. LIVERSIDGE: And let's pull up slide 38 from 17 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's slide deck, if we could. 18 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: Now, Mr. Lanchak, do you recall seeing this slide? 19 20 I do. And what is your understanding of what 21 2.2 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross was contending in this slide? 23 That it's a violation of the injunction and unlawful 24 whenever the code is displayed on the engineer's -- well, the 25 client or laptop or what have you, wherever they're using it

- 1 -- creates an in-memory copy, a RAM copy of the software, and,
- 2 according to Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's opinion, that's a
- 3 violation of the injunction and is unlawful.
- 4 Q And what is your reaction to that?
- 5 A Again, it's ludicrous. I don't understand how one would
- 6 | be able to -- especially in a third-party support capacity --
- 7 | perform the job that you're hired to do, without displaying
- 8 | that code on your own workstation or laptop. It's -- it makes
- 9 no sense.
- 10 Q And when you were working as a third-party support
- 11 provider, did you display JDE open code when you worked with
- 12 | the product?
- 13 A Yes, all the time.
- 14 Q And did you ever see your teams displaying JDE open code
- 15 | when working with the product?
- 16 A Yes, all the time.
- 17 Q And based on your experience in the industry, during your
- 18 | work in the Oracle Enterprise software industry, did you ever
- 19 have any reason to believe that it would be unlawful to
- 20 | display JDE open code?
- 21 A No.
- 22 Q Have you ever seen any industry document suggesting that
- 23 displaying open code is unlawful?
- 24 A I have not.
- 25 | Q In your opinion, from an industry perspective, would it

```
be reasonable to conclude that it may be unlawful to display
 1
 2
     this JDE open code?
 3
      Α
          No.
          Now, Mr. Lanchak, do you recall hearing some testimony
 4
     from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that she had never, in her history
 5
     of working in the industry, seen any reference to these open
 6
 7
     and closed code terms?
 8
      Α
          I do recall that.
 9
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: And let's -- John, if we can,
10
     let's bring up that testimony from the transcript and just
11
     walk through it quickly here.
12
     BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
13
          So if we -- and this is at page 300 of the transcript,
14
     starting at line 10, the question is,
15
                  "In your 45 years of experience, have you
16
          ever heard of a distinction between open code and
17
          closed code?"
                   And the answer is, "Not as it's used here,
18
19
          no.
20
                   "QUESTION: Had you ever seen Rimini make
21
          this distinction in any of its internal documents
2.2
          prior to the time the injunction was issued?"
23
                   And the answer is, "I have not."
24
                   Do you recall that testimony?
25
          I do.
      Α
```

```
I think we have some additional testimony we can go to.
 1
 2
                  "QUESTION: Do any of the sources with which
 3
          you are familiar draw a distinction between open and
          closed source code?
 4
                             I have not seen that distinction
 5
                   "ANSWER:
 6
          written in that with respect to source code for -- in
 7
          its distinction for object code, only modules, ever,
 8
          in my entire career."
 9
                   I think we have one more example:
10
                   "QUESTION: You testified that, you know, in
11
          all your experience, you hadn't heard the term open
12
          and closed code. Do you remember that?
13
                   "ANSWER: Outside this litigation?
14
                   "OUESTION: Yeah, outside this case.
15
                   "ANSWER: Yeah. Correct."
16
                   Mr. Lanchak, do you recall hearing that
17
     testimony?
18
          I do.
      Α
19
          What is your reaction to that testimony?
20
          That's hard to believe, frankly. The terms have been out
21
             I believe I mentioned yesterday that analysts,
2.2
     particularly Gartner, has used the terms in specific relation
23
     to application maintenance and support, and there's also been
24
     internal communications that I believe are entered into the
25
     record from Rimini using terms open and closed code.
```

- Q And you mentioned Gartner, what is Gartner?
- A Gartner is an industry analyst. Gartner is probably the preeminent source of comparative information in the industry.

Everyone subscribes to Gartner, relies on it. It will rank the various, like, application support and maintenance providers. It will rank systems integrators.

We are always trying to get as high a ranking in Gartner as we could because the industry respects Gartner's opinions. It carries a lot of weight.

And we would also meet with Gartner to talk about what we are doing strategically with our practices, and they would report on that, and then they would also talk to us about their views on where they think the industry is going.

So we would have one-on-one meetings with Gartner.

They would meet with all kinds of third-parties, and then we'd also, you know, pay a lot of attention to their publications.

- Q And when you were working in the industry, did you use and rely upon Gartner?
- 19 A I did, extensively.

2.2

MR. LIVERSIDGE: If I could, I would like to bring up an industry publication from Gartner that starts with the Bates numbers Oracle, ORCORST-00639707.

MR. HILL: Objection, your Honor. This document is not in reference to any of Mr. Lanchak's reports and it doesn't have an exhibit -- it's not on Rimini's exhibit list

either.

2.2

MR. LIVERSIDGE: Your Honor, this document was produced from Oracle's files. It's been in production. It's been in the case for years.

And Oracle has come in here and offered testimony that essentially this distinction between open and closed code is something that was essentially made up for litigation purposes.

Ms. Frederiksen-Cross got on the stand and said she's never heard of these terms, these terms don't exist in the industry, and this was all offered on the fly, and we would like to respond and to present the Court with documents that do make the distinction.

It's true that the document was not on his initial considered list, but he has looked at the materials now based on that testimony. He was certain that these materials are out there, and we think the Court would benefit from seeing them.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

I struck all of the supplemental information that was proposed for Ms. Frederiksen-Cross on motion of Rimini, and my view is the same treatment should be applied to the sources we're talking about here.

The objection is sustained.

MR. LIVERSIDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
Would it be -- if the document is not put into
evidence, is it possible to present it as something that the
witness has relied upon in coming up with his opinion? This
has been done with demonstratives and the like.
something that he's relied upon.
              Even if not accepted into evidence, are we able
to present it with him?
              THE COURT: No.
              MR. LIVERSIDGE:
                               Thank you.
BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
     Mr. Lanchak, during the time you worked in the Oracle
Enterprise software industry, was it your understanding that
it could be unlawful to modify or copy the closed code that
came with JDE?
     Yes, that's correct, and I believe that's spelled out
fairly clearly in the licenses that we -- we'd rely on that.
     And based on your work in the industry, was it your
perception that others in the industry had the same view?
 Α
     Yes.
              MR. HILL1: Objection, foundation.
                          I'll allow the question and answer.
              THE COURT:
BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
     The question, Mr. Lanchak, was it your perception that
others in the industry have the same view?
     Yes, it was my perception.
```

```
And did you instruct your teams, when you were working
 1
 2
     with JDE software, not to work with this closed code?
 3
                We would have these conversations often when we
      Α
 4
     were approaching the design phase, getting into the design
 5
    phase.
 6
               And what I would discuss with my teams is I would
 7
     use the terms, you know, "Let's not," you know, "access and
 8
     get into the core architectural code. You guys understand
 9
     this is not what we're supposed to do. Let's bolt on our
10
     customizations through the accessible code," or exposed code
11
     is the term I used to use with my team.
12
          Do you recall testimony from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that
13
     closed source code is not made available to JDE licensees?
14
          I do remember that.
15
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: And, John, maybe we can pull up
16
     that testimony. It's at page 301 of the transcript, lines 15
17
     to 25.
18
     BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
19
          And the question here is,
20
                  "So no closed source code is made available
21
          to JD Edwards licensees; is that right?
2.2
                   "ANSWER:
                             That is correct."
23
                   And then it goes on from there. Do you recall
24
     that testimony?
25
      Α
          I do.
```

- Q And do you agree with Ms. Frederiksen-Cross?
- A No, I don't.

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- This is rather artfully worded. Closed code is supplied with every license. It has to be, that's what really runs the application. So that closed code is compiled source code, and every licensee needs to have it.
- 7 Q And so is it the case that every licensee, in fact, does 8 receive the closed code?
  - A Yes, absolutely.
  - And, also, let me say one more thing about that, and I think this is an important point to get out there.
  - When we talk about object code and source code,
    they're not really two different things. Object code doesn't
    exist in and of itself. It has to have a source, and that
    source is the source code.
    - So it's good to think of it as two sides of the same coin. Where you have source code, you compile it, it's object code, you have object code, you decompile it, and you have source code.
    - Q So is the closed code provided in compiled form?
  - A The closed code is provided in compiled form, and then the license specifically speaks that thou shall not decompile, disassemble, or reverse engineer this closed code.
- 24 Q And as part of your work in the case, did you review the 25 OLSAs and Legacy JDE licenses?

```
I did.
 1
 2
          And did you hear Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's testimony that
 3
     the OLSA and Legacy JDE licenses contain that provision
     prohibiting decompiling, disassembling, and reverse
 4
 5
     engineering JDE code?
          Yes, I did.
 6
      Α
 7
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: And maybe we can bring that up,
 8
     John.
     BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
 9
10
          And the question was,
11
                  "You're aware that the Oracle license and
12
          service agreement has a restriction against
13
          decompiling and reverse engineering?
14
                   "ANSWER: Yes, that's pretty standard in
15
          software that's distributing object code only.
16
                   "And you're aware that JDE Legacy licenses
17
          have the same?
18
                              The ones I have examined all have
                   "ANSWER:
19
          that provision."
20
                   Do you recall that testimony from
21
     Ms. Frederiksen-Cross?
2.2
      Α
          I do.
23
          And do you agree with her?
24
          Yes, I do agree with her. That is pretty standard.
      Α
25
          And I think we have an example of one of the licenses
```

- that you reviewed in coming up with your opinions and conclusions, and that is OREX\_67 which I believe is preadmitted, if we can bring that up.
- Mr. Lanchak, do you recall reviewing this particular

  license which I believe is a JDE Legacy license with Giant

  Cement?
- 7 A **Yes, I do.**
- 8 Q And is this one of the licenses that you reviewed as part
  9 of your work in the case?
- 10 A It is.
- 11 Q And are the terms open and closed code used in this
  12 license?
- 13 A The terms aren't specifically used in this license, but
  14 the concepts are in this license.
- And, again, it's important to just remember, open and closed -- they're just labels that we're using. It's the concepts which rely on the context of how the code is used that is most important.
- 20 And does this license contain a prohibition against decompiling or disassembling JDE code?
- 21 A It does.
- MR. LIVERSIDGE: All right. Let's pull up
- 23 | Section 71, if we could, John.
- 24 **BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:**
- 25 Q And, Mr. Lanchak, is this one of the license provisions

```
1
     you were referring to?
 2
          It is.
      Α
 3
          And this particular provision says,
                  "Customer shall not, or cause anyone else to:
 4
 5
          Reverse engineer, disassemble, decompile, or
 6
          otherwise attempt to discover the source code of any
 7
          part of the software."
 8
                   Do you see that?
 9
          I do.
      Α
10
          And is that one of the provisions you reviewed in coming
     up with this case --
11
12
          Yes, it is.
      Α
13
          Your opinions. I'm sorry.
14
          Yes, it is.
15
          And do you believe this provision supports your opinions
     in this case?
16
17
          I do. This provision is referring to the closed code,
18
     that core architectural code that the software developer is
19
     trying to protect.
20
               And let's remember, back when these licenses were
21
     originally written, usually in the late '90s, it was the wild
2.2
     west in EOP market. New entrants were coming into the market
23
     all the time.
24
               Companies realized that they needed to protect their
25
     intellectual property which was contained in that closed
```

layer, and these provisions became very, very common, and that 1 2 was the intent. We don't want anyone decompiling this code to 3 see how we did what we did, and then copying it in their own 4 software. 5 And is the closed code the code layer that needs to be 6 decompiled in order to access? 7 Yes, absolutely. Α 8 And are there other provisions in this license that you 9 believe support your opinions? 10 There are. Α 11 MR. LIVERSIDGE: Let's pull up provisions 1-ii, 12 and 7-iii, and 3. BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: 13 14 And, Mr. Lanchak, just going back to my prior question to 15 clarify, is the closed code the code layer that needs to be 16 decompiled in order to access and copy the source code? 17 Α It is. 18 Thank you. Let's look at these provisions. Are these other 19 20 provisions that you reviewed in connection with coming up with 21 your opinions and conclusions? 2.2 Α Yes, they are. 23 And the first one refers to access to the software 24 being allowed for,

"Independent contractors engaged by customer

1 who require access to the software to perform their 2 tasks." 3 And what about paragraph 7? What is it in that paragraph that you believe supports your opinions? 4 5 Α Yeah. And here it says, 6 "Customer shall not, or cause anyone else to 7 copy the documentation or software except to the 8 extent necessary...to support the users." 9 And the users are the ones that obviously are 10 utilizing the functionality of the software. 11 So it is supporting the need to go in and modify 12 and copy that open code portion of the software which is in 13 support of the users of the software. 14 And then if we look at paragraph 3, it says, 15 "For any access to the software other than by 16 an employee of customer, customer shall not provide 17 access to source code and all provided access shall 18 be restricted to screen access for the functions 19 required." 20 Now, is that a provision that you reviewed in 21 coming up with your opinions and conclusions? 2.2 That is a provision I've reviewed, and that is how 23 third-party service providers work. 24 You're granted access, screen access, to the 25 functions that you need to perform. So that would mean, if

```
you're a contractor working on a support engagement or an implementation engagement for a particular client, they're going to grant you certain permissions, certain access to certain portions of that sytem; i.e., the development environment. You would not get access to the production environment.
```

Conversely, if you're -- let's say you're outsourcing their accounts payable function, and you're an accounts payable clerk, you'll have screen access to the production version, just the accounts payable function, that you need to perform your job.

- Q And, in your experience, do third-party support providers provide JDE support through screen access?
- 14 A **Yes.**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

- Q And are third-parties able to modify and copy the open code using screen access?
- 17 A Yes, they are.
- 18 Q And does a third-party have access to Oracle tools
  19 through the screen access?
- 20 A Yes, they do.
- 21 Q And do you have experience, yourself, using screen access?
- 23 A Yes, I've used screen access many times in my career.
- 24 Q And is that how you and your teams provided support for 25 JDE software when you were working in the industry?

A Yes, it is.

2.2

Q All right. Thank you.

Let's go back, now, to your summary of key reasons.

Let's go to DDX-709, and we're on key reason number 2, and you indicate,

"Oracle has never before taken this position.

Oracle says the exact opposite and provides tools for the specific purpose of modifying and copying JD

Edwards code."

And is that your second key reason, Mr. Lanchak?

A It is, absolutely.

In the 18 years I've spent working exclusively with Oracle products and Oracle corporation, they have always promoted the use of the tools.

In meetings I've had with them, and the documentation that we would review, you know, on the Web, related to JD Edwards, these tools are there.

There are even coding standards provided in the description of these tools. It tells you, if you're going to go into the native C code and make changes, you know, here are the correct standards to use.

So, again, it's presenting that open layer of code on a silver platter for the licensee and the licensee's designates, and to now say it's illegal or unlawful or a violation to use these tools, on the face of it, it makes no

sense.

2.2

Q Let's go to our next slide, which I think just provides some key points in this area.

We've already talked a fair bit about the tools, but what do you have in mind when you say "marketing and promotion and customizations for clients"?

A Yeah. So regarding marketing and promotion, a big part of my job, especially at MarketSphere, was working with Oracle to come up with promotional campaigns for JD Edwards, and those promotional campaigns often promoted customizations.

For instance, I have one in my report, an example, where we had a promotional campaign together with a company called DSI, Data Systems International. DSI had some independent third-party application that they said if you integrate this with JD Edwards, it's going to, you know, add value, measurable business value to your environment.

So we would come up with our JD Edwards clients. We'd invite them to these webinars. Oracle would reach out to some of their clients, invite them to these webinars, and we would make this pitch to them about, you know, hey, let us, you know, serve you lunch and tell you about how we can add this kind of value to your JD Edwards system through DSI and the custom code changes we would need to make to utilize this new application.

So we did that on, you know, many occasions, and,

2.2

you know, Oracle would be, you know, in the room with us when we were holding these webinars.

And then customizations, this was something, you know, we did all the time. Every time there would be customizations.

And, you know, one example that I worked on where I actually did the customizations myself, I designed and developed them in RPG, was when the crude oil windfall profits tax was enacted by Congress, and this is going back a ways, but we were working with oil and gas exploration and drilling firms that were on JD Edwards World at the time.

You know, this act comes down from Congress, it has to be responded to, and JD Edwards at the time -- I forget the reason, either they didn't have the bandwidth, or they felt it was too small of a niche for them to respond to this, told us -- and this is when I was with Arthur Andersen -- that we should develop it for the customers.

So we developed a whole module to handle the crude oil windfall profits tax, and then we sold that to additional oil drilling and exploration companies mainly in the Texas market.

So that's one example. Another example, more recent, is work we did for the Renewable Energy Group in Ames, Iowa, a bio-diesel producer. And we assessed their business requirements as I described yesterday, and we selected JD

```
Edwards because we felt it was a good fit, but it still needed a lot of customizations to accommodate the bio-diesel industry.
```

For instance, we had to add field, fields to existing screens, we had to add new screens that we -- and the functionality for those screens, and this was all because they had some fairly unique shipping requirements, multi-modal shipping requirements for bio-diesel that required shipment via rail, truck, both.

And then there were different types of requirements for shipping the bio-diesel. You could do it by least cost, preferred route, or you could allocate various percents to the various carriers.

So JD Edwards obviously is not going to accommodate bio-diesel shipping right out of the box. We had to build that functionality onto -- bolt it onto the software through that open code layer.

Q Okay. Thank you for that.

Shifting gears slightly now, Mr. Lanchak, are you familiar with a third-party support provider named Spinnaker?

A I am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- 22 Now, have you undertaken an analysis of Spinnaker's
  23 processes as it relates to JDE support?
- 24 A No, I have not.
- 25 Q Have you reviewed materials in this case about

Spinnaker's support processes, including Spinnaker's 1 2 sworn statements and Oracle's testimony under oath regarding 3 those processes? I believe there's Mathew Stava's 4 Yes, I have. 5 declaration, and also the Buffy Ransom deposition that I 6 reviewed. 7 And did you review those materials in coming up with your 8 opinions and conclusions in this case? 9 I did. Α 10 MR. LIVERSIDGE: John, if we could pull up 11 DTX-733, which I believe is in evidence at this point, and go 12 to paragraph 14. BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: 13 14 Mr. Lanchak, you indicated that you reviewed Mr. Stava's 15 declaration. Is this the declaration you were referring to? 16 MR. LIVERSIDGE: We want to go to the first 17 page, maybe, of that. 18 THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. LIVERSIDGE: All right, and let's go to 19 20 paragraph 14. 21 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: 2.2 And who is Mr. Stava according to your understanding? 23 My understanding is that at that time, I don't know if he 24 still is, but he was the CEO of Spinnaker. 25 And if you look at paragraph 14 of Mr. Stava's

declaration, it says, 1 2 "Spinnaker Support develops fixes for its JD 3 Edwards customers. These fixes include product fixes 4 and operational work-arounds; updates, including but 5 not limited to tax and regulatory updates; and custom 6 code solution for its customers. Fixes, updates and 7 custom code solutions developed by Spinnaker support 8 may take the form of source code changes, 9 configuration changes, and data changes; or, may take the form of a 'paper fix' or other instructional 10 11 document." 12 Do you recall reading that sworn statement from 13 Mr. Stava? 14 I do.

15

16

17

18

19

21

2.2

23

24

25

And when Mr. Stava says,

"The fixes, updates, and custom code solutions developed by Spinnaker Support may take the form of source code changes, configuration changes, and data changes,"

20 what is your understanding of what he means by that?

- Well, he's referring to Spinnaker's use of that open code layer in JD Edwards. He's clearly not talking about the closed code layer because that's prohibited by the licenses.
- And did you see any response from Oracle concerning Spinnaker's support processes?

A I did.

- 2 MR. LIVERSIDGE: And let's go to DDX-724, which
- 3 I believe is also admitted at this point, and we have on the
- 4 | screen a letter from Deborah Miller, Vice-President and
- 5 Associate General Counsel of Oracle, to Mr. Stava.
- 6 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
- 7 Q Mr. Lanchak, did you review this information in coming up
- 8 | with your opinions and conclusions?
- 9 | A **I did**.
- 10 Q If we can bring up the -- and is it your understanding
- 11 | that Oracle, along with its outside legal counsel, Bingham
- 12 McCutchen, conducted an audit on premises at Spinnaker of its
- 13 | support processes?
- 14 A **Yes.**
- 15 Q If we go down in the letter it says,
- 16 "Based upon that review and the information
- provided, we have determined that (a) Spinnaker's
- current practices and procedures are respectful of
- and do not infringe upon Oracle's intellectual
- 20 property rights and (b) do not violate Oracle's
- 21 license agreements with its clients."
- 22 And that's information that you reviewed in
- 23 | coming up with your opinions?
- 24 A It is.
- 25 Q And do you believe that supports your opinions in this

```
1
     case?
 2
          I believe it very much supports my opinions.
 3
          Why do you say that?
          Because Oracle is essentially saying those things that
 4
     Spinnaker does to support and maintain JD Edwards, the things
 5
 6
     that everyone does to support and maintain JD Edwards, that
 7
     those things that you do are respectful and do not infringe
 8
     upon Oracle's intellectual property rights.
 9
          And did you also review testimony from Oracle's corporate
10
     representative regarding Spinnaker Support?
11
      Α
          I did.
12
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE:
                                    Let's bring this up, John, and
13
     we'll go through it quickly. If we go to page 163, 12 to 15.
     BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
14
15
          And the question here is,
16
                  "So does this paragraph contain an accurate
17
          description of Spinnaker Support policies as they
18
          were presented to Oracle during the 2011 audit?"
19
                   Mr. Lanchak, is it your understanding that in
20
     the deposition Oracle was presented with Mr. Stava's
21
     declaration and asked to respond to the paragraphs in that
2.2
     declaration?
23
      Α
          Yes.
24
          Let's go to our next testimony, which is 164, 4
25
     through 10.
```

And Oracle's corporate representative was asked, 1 2 "And is it fair to say that Oracle concluded 3 that it was proper for Spinnaker to develop fixes, updates, and custom code solutions for its customers 4 that may take the form of source code changes, 5 6 configuration changes, and data changes for its 7 clients in the manner described in this paragraph? 8 "ANSWER: Yes." 9 Did you review that information? 10 I did. Α 11 Do you believe it supports your opinions in this case? 12 I believe it does. 13 Why do you say that? 14 Well, because this particular Oracle executive is saying 15 that the fixes, the updates, the custom code solutions, which 16 is what, you know, I've been talking about since yesterday, 17 that those would take the form of code changes and that that 18 is allowable and permissible. In your view in this testimony, is Oracle essentially 19 20 saying the same thing you're saying? 21 Yes, I think this is exactly what I've been saying. 2.2 All right. If we to our next testimony, which is 156, 3 23 through 10, the question is, 24 "Did Oracle conclude that Spinnaker's 25 processes do not infringe upon Oracle's intellectual

```
1
          property rights?
 2
                   "ANSWER:
                             Yes.
 3
                   "And did Oracle conclude that Spinnaker's
 4
          processes do not violate Oracle's license agreements
 5
          with its clients?
 6
                   "ANSWER: Yes."
 7
                   And this is information you reviewed?
 8
      Α
          Yes, it is.
 9
          And you believe this supports your opinions?
10
          I believe it does.
11
          Let's go back to our summary of key reasons, which is
12
     DDX-711.
13
               And your final key reason, Mr. Lanchak, that
14
     you disagree with Ms. Frederiksen-Cross is that the
15
     interpretation, in your opinion, would foreclose third-party
16
     support for JD Edwards software; is that correct?
17
          That is correct.
18
          And why do you say that?
          I say that because the definition of source code put
19
20
     forth by Ms. Frederiksen-Cross would essentially result in
21
     banning third-party support of JD Edwards software.
2.2
          And, in your opinion, could Rimini support JDE if it did
23
     not have the ability to create tax, legal and regulatory
24
     updates?
25
          No, it could not.
```

```
And to your understanding, is the ability to create tax,
 1
 2
     legal, and regulatory updates an important part of Rimini
 3
     Street support offering to clients?
                   MR. HILL: Objection, foundation.
 4
                   THE COURT:
 5
                               I'll allow the question.
                                                          I think
 6
     sufficient foundation has been established.
 7
                   THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
 8
     BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
 9
          Yes, I can.
10
               In your opinion, is Rimini Street's offering of tax,
11
     legal, and regulatory updates an important part of the
12
     offering that Rimini Street provides to its JDE clients?
13
      Α
          Yes.
                It's one of the key things that Rimini's clients
14
     hire Rimini to do.
15
          And could Rimini design, develop, and test tax, legal,
16
     and regulatory updates without modifying and copying open code
17
     in your view?
18
          No, they could not.
          And could Rimini use the tools to develop and test
19
20
     without modifying open code?
21
      Α
          No.
2.2
          Could Rimini do break fix support without the ability to
23
     modify and copy open code?
24
          Absolutely not.
      Α
25
          What is break fix support?
```

A Well, break fix is what it sounds like.

You know, these software applications contain millions of lines of code and things can go wrong, and when they go wrong, it can be, you know, catastrophic.

So let me give you an example. So let's say you are a staffing firm and you have thousands of third-party support contractors that you need to pay. Your customers pay you, you need to now pay the contractors that work for you.

And let's say it's a Friday, and you're running the application -- the portion of the application that processes payments for these third-party contractors, and all of a sudden, inexplicably, it stops, it ends, it crashes.

If you're the CIO, you're immediately on the phone with your support provider saying, "We have a Sev 1 issue," which means of severity 1 issue, "we need to get this fixed.

I have people expecting to get paid today that have bills to pay. If they don't get paid this Friday, there's going to be hell to pay. This is going to be bad. Get it fixed."

Well, you know, with break fix, immediately what would happen is a support engineer would get on the system, actually start looking around, exploring the database layer, the application layer, infrastructure layer, and try and find out what's going on here, what's going wrong.

And, you know, they're working at the speed of thought basically, hands on the keyboard, doing exploratory

2.2

surgery on this application, trying to find the cause of this break. Okay?

So if we take a step back and say, okay, based on Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's definition of source code and what it says is unlawful, what this now means is that this support engineer, who would take the phone call and say, "Hmm, I understand what you're saying. Hold on. I'm going to get the first flight out. I'm going to fly to your site, because I can't look at your code remotely, fly to your site," which may be halfway across the country, "check into my hotel, then I'll come over, and I'll look over your shoulder as you start trying to find this issue."

Now, I'm going to tell you, that would be completely unacceptable for that customer.

There are service levels that are negotiated in these types of third-party support contracts, and a service level means that if there's a break fix incident like this, it has to be resolved in a certain period, short period of time. If it's not, there are penalties.

And if these infractions happen too often, or there are too many of them, I believe the client could, you know, walk away from the contract.

So you have to be responsive to these types of incidents if you want to stay in the third-party support maintenance business.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

what to do.

- Now, I take it from your explanation you heard testimony during this proceeding that at one point Rimini had considered an over-the-shoulder method? Yes, I have seen that. And so, in your opinion, could Rimini have provided meaningful JDE support going forward using an over-the-shoulder method of support? Α No, they cannot. And could Rimini, itself, even provide tax, legal, and regulatory updates directly to customers using this over-the-shoulder method? Α No. Would Rimini have required customers to engage employees or other third-parties to actually do the implementation? Well, see, that's the point. Because, you know, even if it's a more mundane type of change, it's going to be frustrating for that client to have to take someone that they have doing some other job, put them at that computer with the
  - That's going to be frustrating because there's an opportunity cost associated with that individual, the client individual, sitting at that commuter. They need to be doing their normal day job, not doing Rimini's work.

Rimini engineer over their shoulder, you know, telling them

So you could see it's going to be very frustrating,

and what would result is that customer would eventually look for a way out of that contract with Rimini, or wait for the expiration of that contract, and then go elsewhere for their services.

Furthermore, you wouldn't get any new business -let me repeat that -- no new business with that type of
approach. You would not acquire any more support and
maintenance contracts. No one would buy that service.

- Q And during the time that you were working in the industry, were you ever aware of any company that provided ongoing maintenance and support for JDE using this over-the-shoulder method?
- 13 A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

2.2

23

24

- 14 Q Do you recall testimony from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that
  15 it would be prohibited for Rimini to remotely connect to its
  16 clients to do the over-the-shoulder support?
- 17 | A **Yes, I do.**
- MR. LIVERSIDGE: And maybe we can bring that up,

  John. I think it's at 543, lines 5 through 18.
- 20 **BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:** 
  - Q And I think the question starts about on line 7,

    "I wanted to touch up on one issue which is
    you mention this concept of a Rimini engineer
    standing next to someone who is allowed to look at
    the code. And I wanted -- and I think you said

```
1
          that's okay. Can a Rimini engineer do the same thing
 2
          remotely?
 3
                             I think that's a slipperier slope
          because, if they're doing it remotely, at least a
 4
 5
          video portion of the call, the only thing they can
 6
          have is on their remote machine at the time that they
 7
          reviewing, and so there is a copy of the code in a
 8
          form remotely on their machine.
 9
                   "QUESTION:
                               So they can't?
10
                             I would think that would be
                   "ANSWER:
11
          prohibited."
12
                   Do you recall that testimony?
13
      Α
          I do.
14
          And so is it your understanding that
15
     Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's view is that a Rimini employee
16
     must literally be looking over the physical shoulder of its
17
     client at the client's building in order to provide support?
18
                And that was what I was describing in my example of
          Yes.
19
     break fix support, that a Rimini engineer -- or any
20
     third-party support engineer -- needing to get on a plane in
21
     the middle of a crisis to fly physically to that site to
2.2
     physically look over the shoulder of the employee as they
23
     would access modifying copy of the code, it's ludicrous.
24
          And, in your opinion, would it even be feasible to have a
25
     remote viewing access model with no ability to remotely access
```

- and view the code? 1
- 2 No, it makes no sense.
- 3 Do you recall testimony from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that
- she did not believe that paragraph 10 of the injunction would

be rendered superfluous by her interpretation of paragraph 8?

- I do recall that. 6
  - And do you agree with her?
- 8 Α I don't.

4

5

- 9 Now, maybe we can bring up -- I MR. LIVERSIDGE:
- 10 think it's, John, page 4 of docket number 1459.
- 11 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE:
- 12 And here we have the two paragraphs of the injunction,
- 13 paragraph 8 and paragraph 10, and, Mr. Lanchak, why do you
- 14 disagree with Ms. Frederiksen-Cross?
- 15 Well, paragraph 10 is alluding to third-party support
- 16 going on because it's really what I believe is called a
- 17 cross-use type of issue. So it's assuming that there's
- 18 third-party support.
- Well, paragraph 8 essentially is banning third-party 19
- 20 support by prohibiting and making unlawful the copying of JD
- 21 Edwards software source code.
- 2.2 And when you say paragraph 8 is banning third-party
- 23 support, are you referring to Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's
- 24 interpretation?
- 25 I am. Her interpretation of that is that that would

```
be -- that interpretation includes all code associated with JD
 1
 2
     Edwards. And if you're going to say you cannot copy all code
 3
     associated with JD Edwards software support, you're
     essentially banning third-party support of that application,
 4
 5
     and that's not what paragraph 10 seems to indicate.
 6
          And does paragraph 10 contemplate development and testing
 7
     of JDE updates by Rimini?
 8
      Α
          It does.
 9
          And would Rimini need to modify and copy open code in
     order to provide development and testing of JDE updates?
10
11
          Absolutely. So I think -- in my opinion, it renders 10
      Α
12
     superfluous.
                   Yes.
13
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE:
                                    Thank you, Mr. Lanchak.
14
                   No further questions.
15
                   THE COURT: Cross-examination.
16
                   MR. HILL: Your Honor, may I approach with
17
     witness binders?
18
                   THE COURT: Yes, sure.
19
                   MR. HILL: Good morning, Mr. Lanchak.
20
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Good morning, Mr. Hill.
21
                            CROSS-EXAMINATION
     BY MR. HILL:
2.2
23
          Mr. Lanchak, you are not a computer scientist, correct?
24
      Α
          That is correct.
25
          And understanding that you're not a computer scientist,
```

- do you have an opinion on the definition of the term source code?
- 3 | A I do.
- Would you defer to Mr. -- Professor Astrachan on the definition of source code?
- A My definition of source code is human-readable code, and
- 7 I believe, you know, he said something to that same effect.
- 8 Q And the closed code that you've talked about that
- 9 licensees receive when they get the JDE software, that's not
- 10 human-readable code, is it?
- 11 A It's provided in object code form, so --
- 12 Q So what the licensees receive is not human-readable code,
- 13 | correct?
- 14 A It's not. It's compiled source code so it can be
- 15 | converted to human-readable code.
- 16 Q When you say -- okay.
- And, Mr. Lanchak, you're not an expert at
- 18 | interpreting Oracle licenses, correct?
- 19 A I am not.
- 20 Q But you looked at a lot of JD Edwards licenses in
- 21 | preparing your opinions, correct?
- 22 | A I did.
- 23 Q And I think you mentioned this, but the terms closed code
- 24 and open code, those are not contained in any JD Edwards
- 25 license that you have seen, correct?

A That's correct.

- 2 Q And it's your opinion that it would be effectively
- 3 | impossible to use, maintain, or support JD Edwards software in
- 4 a meaningful way without copying JDE open code, correct?
- 5 A That is correct.
- 6 Q And, in fact, it's your opinion that there's no level of
- 7 | support that Rimini could provide to its JDE customers without
- 8 | copying the JDE open code, correct?
- 9 A There's no level of meaningful support, I believe is what
- 10 I said, yes.
- I mean, that's not to say they can -- they can
- 12 answer the phone and answer users' questions about how, you
- 13 know, something works. They can set up, you know, new user
- 14 | IDs, perhaps.
- But, I'm talking about meaningful support, those
- 16 types of serious items and significant items.
- 17 Q And as for tax, legal, and regulatory updates, it would
- 18 be effectively impossible for Rimini to create those without
- 19 | copying JDE open code, correct?
- 20 A **Yes.**
- 21 Q And it would be effectively impossible for any
- 22 | support provider to provide break fix support without copying
- 23 the JD Edwards open code, correct?
- 24 A **Yes.**
- 25 Q And it's your opinion that no support provider could

1 effectively provide support to JDE customers by remotely 2 viewing the customer's screen and providing that 3 over-the-shoulder support, correct? 4 Based on the definition of source code that was put forth by Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, yes. 5 6 And these opinions that you've just talked about, about 7 the inability to provide effective support, those are not 8 based on your analysis of the details of Rimini's support 9 offerings, correct? It's based on the -- my review of the materials in this 10 11 case and my experience working in the industry over all these 12 years. 13 But I think you testified yesterday that you haven't done 14 that detailed analysis of Rimini's processes --15 Α I have --16 (Simultaneous indecipherable conversation.) 17 MR. HILL: I'll ask my question again. 18 BY MR. HILL: You haven't done that detailed analysis of Rimini's 19 20 processes and procedures to determine if it would be possible, 21 correct? 2.2 That's correct, I haven't done a detailed analysis of 23 Rimini's processes and procedures. I wasn't asked to do that 24 as part of my task. 25 And you don't have an opinion on exactly what Rimini does

```
and doesn't do in terms of its JDE support processes, correct?
 1
 2
          Well, I haven't reviewed, as we just said, their -- I
 3
     haven't reviewed the specific processes and procedures that
     Rimini does, but, I have worked in the industry quite a bit,
 4
     and I understand what Rimini does from the documentation I've
 5
 6
     seen and from my industry experience.
 7
          But when you formed your opinions, you didn't even know
 8
     if Rimini provided break fix support, correct?
 9
          That's not correct.
                   MR. HILL: Matt, could you pull up, from
10
11
     Mr. Lanchak's June 2020 deposition page 181, line 16.
12
     BY MR. HILL:
13
          Mr. Lanchak, I asked you,
14
                  "Does Rimini provide break fix support to its
15
          JD Edwards clients?
16
                   "ANSWER: Yeah.
                                    I haven't Rimini's specific
17
          services so I'm not going to provide an opinion on
18
          exactly what they do and don't do."
19
                   That's your testimony, correct?
20
          That is my testimony.
      Α
21
               And what I'm saying there is that I wasn't going to
2.2
     comment on that because I hadn't done that detailed analysis.
23
          Mr. Lanchak, you're not an expert in tax, legal, or
24
     regulatory updates for JD Edwards, correct?
25
          I'm an expert in understanding what tax, legal, and
```

- 1 | regulatory updates are. I've been involved in applying those
- 2 updates, but I'm not an expert in creating those updates or
- doing the research, the analysis necessary in understanding
- 4 what updates need to be created.
- 5 | Q You've never designed and coded a tax, legal, or
- 6 | regulatory update, correct?
- 7 A That is correct.
- 8 Q You talked about Spinnaker a little bit. Spinnaker is a
- 9 Rimini support competitor, correct?
- 10 A That is correct.
- 11 Q And you haven't done the analysis of Spinnaker support
- 12 processes, just like with Rimini's, to determine whether they
- copy JDE open code when they support JDE customers, correct?
- 14 A I have not done that analysis of their processes, but I
- 15 | have just relied on the sworn statement by Mathew Stava and
- some of the other documentation I've seen.
- MR. HILL: Matt, could you pull up DTX-733,
- 18 | paragraph 14, again.
- 19 BY MR. HILL:
- 20 Q And this is the portion that you're referencing where
- 21 Mr. Stava says, in your opinion, that Spinnaker copies JDE
- 22 open code?
- 23 A **Yes.**
- 24 Q Okay. Now, in making -- in creating these updates
- 25 | mentioned here, you don't know if Spinnaker actually

```
1
     implemented those directly, or if the customer implemented
 2
     those with Spinnaker remotely providing support, correct?
 3
          I don't know specifically how those were conducted,
     that's correct. But I do -- can infer that Spinnaker, from
 4
 5
     what I'm reading here, would be executing those changes.
 6
               I would think -- I'd back up that by saying that I
 7
     don't think Spinnaker would be as successful as they are today
 8
     if they were not making those open code changes themselves.
 9
          Can you identify any Spinnaker customers from 2011?
10
          Not offhand.
11
          And so that means you don't know the terms of the license
12
     of any of those Spinnaker customers in 2011, correct?
13
      Α
          Well, I've seen lots of JD Edwards licenses, and I know
14
     they're going to be pretty standard from customer to customer.
          But specifically, in 2011, you can't identify any license
15
16
     for any of the Spinnaker customers, correct?
17
          If you're asking me specifically can I identify a license
18
     between Spinnaker and one of its clients, no, I cannot.
19
          Mr. Lanchak, what is an Oracle integration license?
20
          An Oracle integration license?
21
          Yes.
      Q
2.2
      Α
          I'm not familiar with that term.
23
          You have never heard that before?
24
          I don't recall what that would be.
      Α
```

All the companies that you work for in the industry, that

- includes Accenture, KPMG, BearingPoint, HCL, they're all part
- of the Oracle Partner Network, correct?
- 3 A That is correct.
- 4 Q ERP Suite, that company is part of the Oracle Partner
- 5 Network, correct?
- 6 A I believe they are.
- 7 Q SpearMC?
- 8 A I believe they are as well.
- 9 Q And if they're part of the Oracle Partner Network, that
- 10 means they all had a partner agreement in place with Oracle,
- 11 | correct?
- 12 A Yes. I'm very familiar with those Oracle partner
- agreements. They were primarily focused around business
- 14 development, and governed the payment of fees such as co-sale
- 15 | fees and resale fees for the integrator that was facilitating
- 16 | the sale of an Oracle license.
- 17 Q But you don't know the terms of any of those Oracle
- 18 partner agreements, correct?
- 19 A I don't recall the specific terms. We're talking a few
- 20 | years ago.
- 21 Q And you don't know the terms of the Oracle partner
- 22 agreements for any of the companies in the JD Edwards support
- 23 | ecosystem, correct?
- 24 A Can you repeat that question, please.
- 25 Q You don't know the terms of the Oracle partner agreements

- for any of the companies in the JDE support ecosystem,

  correct?
  - A I haven't seen their specific terms; that's correct.
- And you mentioned I believe yesterday that many of the big projects you worked for in JDE were integration projects,
- 6 correct, systems integration projects?
- A It included integration and implementation, but there
  were large elements of support and maintenance in those
  engagements as well.
- 2 And you -- because you don't know the terms of the Oracle partner agreements, you don't know if any of the entities that you worked for, as part of their Oracle partner agreements,
- 13 | had a license from Oracle, correct?
- 14 A Can you repeat that?

- 15 Q You don't know if any of the entities that you worked for in the industry, as part of their Oracle partner agreements,
- 17 | had a license from Oracle, correct?
- 18 A As I said before, I don't recall all the specific terms
  19 in these agreements, but if we had a license for these
- 20 applications, I believe it would have been for our use of
- 21 those applications in the course of operating our business.
- 22 Q But, again, you don't know the terms of those partner 23 agreements, correct?
- 24 A I don't recall the detailed terms of those
- 25 partner agreements. As I said, they're more business

```
1
     development-oriented and governed the payment of resale
 2
     or co-sale fees by Oracle to us for helping Oracle sell those
 3
     licenses. That's what I remember about them.
 4
                   MR. HILL: Matt, could you put up tab 1, please.
 5
                   This is tab 1 in your binder. At the very end
 6
     there's a series of tabs. This is the first one.
 7
     document entitled Oracle Partner Network Policies.
 8
                   Matt, could you go to page 6 under section C --
 9
                   THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Mr. Hill, what tab am I
10
     looking at here?
11
                   MR. HILL: It's tab 1 in your binder. It's
12
     towards the very end. It's after the depositions and --
13
                   THE WITNESS: Oh, tab 1. Okay. I thought you
14
    meant the first tab.
15
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: I'm sorry to interject.
16
     Honor, can we get an exhibit number for this document?
17
                   MR. HILL: Your Honor, this doesn't have an
18
     exhibit number. I'm not offering to admit it at this point,
19
     I'm just establishing foundation.
                   THE COURT: Well, let's at least mark it for
20
21
     identification in the event it is later referred to.
2.2
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: Well, your Honor, they objected
23
     to me showing the witness documents not on the trial exhibit
24
     list. I don't believe this document is on their trial exhibit
25
     list.
```

-1341<del>-</del>

```
1
                   MR. HILL:
                             This is cross-examination, your
 2
     Honor.
             This is not on our exhibit list.
 3
                   THE COURT: I'll allow it for a limited purpose.
 4
     I'm not going to admit it.
                   MR. HILL: Understood.
 5
     BY MR. HILL:
 6
 7
          Are you with me, Mr. Lanchak, on tab 1?
 8
      Α
          Yes, I have it.
 9
          Could you look at page 6 under section C.
               And do you see where it says -- this section C is
10
11
     Application Programs, and do you see where it says,
12
                  "If you join the license and hardware track,
13
          you may order an unlimited number of integration
14
          licenses for use with your proprietary application
15
          program as described in your OPM agreement."
16
                   Do you see that.
17
                Give me a second to just look at that.
      Α
18
          Sure.
                   THE COURT: Mr. Smith [sic], I'm going to cut
19
20
     you off here. He's previously testified that he's not
21
     familiar with the terms, doesn't know the terms of the Oracle
2.2
     partnership agreement.
23
                   I assume that what you're producing here is, in
24
     fact, the current edition of the Oracle partner agreement, but
25
     if he doesn't know it, he's not familiar with the terms, the
```

document hasn't been produced before, I'm going to cut you 1 2 off. 3 MR. HILL: Understood, your Honor. 4 BY MR. HILL: 5 Mr. Lanchak, that integration license mentioned in that 6 document, you're not familiar with that, correct? 7 This specific license, I'm not. This is dated 2021, so I 8 wouldn't be familiar with this particular version. 9 Are you familiar with any version of an integration license? I think you said before you hadn't --10 11 Oh, no. I thought you were talking about the partner 12 agreement. I'm sorry, the integration license, no, I'm not. 13 Okay. And you're not familiar with the terms of an 14 integration license, correct? 15 As I said, I don't recall the integration license. 16 So you don't know if an integration license gives the 17 licensee the license to access and copy JDE open code, 18 correct? Well, what I'd tell you is, you know, there may be terms 19 20 for some of the larger providers that are in place currently. 21 I don't know if they were in place when I was dealing with 2.2 these systems. 23 But you also have a lot of these smaller providers 24 that are doing the exact same work, the LLCs that I talked

about, the independent third-party contractors that do not

- have any of these provisions governing their use of the software.
- 3 Q Mr. Liversidge asked you about the mom and pop shops.
- 4 You mentioned SpearMC and ERP Suites, correct?
- A Yes. And then I also talked about the tier in the ecosystem below that which would be these LLCs made up of
- 7 three, five, seven people that do the same modification work.
- 8 Q And ERP Suites and SpearMC, you mentioned they have an
- 9 Oracle partner agreement, correct?
- 10 A They may or may not. I do not know.
- 11 Q I believe --
- 12 A Oh, oh, I'm sorry. I thought (unintelligible) the
- 13 integration agreement.
- 14 Q No, just a partner agreement.
- 15 A Just partner -- yeah, I believe ERP Suites and SpearMC
- does -- they both have a partner agreement.
- 17 Q And for those small, five- to seven-person operations,
- 18 | you don't their license arrangements with Oracle or --
- 19 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, sir. Would you
- 20 repeat the question a little slower.
- 21 MR. HILL: Sorry.
- 22 BY MR. HILL:
- 23 Q Those smaller shops with the five to seven people you
- 24 | mentioned, you don't have any understanding of their
- 25 | arrangements or agreements, licenses with Oracle, correct?

I don't specifically, but I have worked quite a bit with 1 2 them in the 18 years that I've been working with Oracle, and I 3 feel -- my opinion is that they do not, and I saw no indication that they had any kind of agreements with Oracle 4 5 when I was working with them. 6 Well, you didn't work for them, right? You worked 7 for these --8 No, but I hired them on my teams, so they would be on my 9 projects. 10 But you wouldn't be privy to their contractual agreements 11 and negotiations with Oracle, correct? 12 Well, as I said, specifically, I wouldn't. But being so 13 familiar with what they did, how they did it, and their 14 involvement on my teams, I feel pretty certain they did not 15 have any kind of documentation -- or agreements with Oracle. 16 But you don't know, right? 17 I haven't specifically asked them that question in the 18 past. Mr. Lanchak, it's not your view that Oracle's 19 20 interpretation of the injunction prevents JDE licensees from 21 copying the open JDE code, correct? 2.2 Α I'm sorry, can you repeat that. 23 It's not your view that Oracle's interpretation of 24 the injunction prohibits licensees from accessing the JDE open

25

code, correct?

No, that's incorrect. It would prohibit them as well. 1 2 If it's unlawful, it's unlawful. 3 MR. HILL: Well -- Matt, could you bring up the injunction, ECF 1166, paragraph 8. 4 BY MR. HILL: 5 6 As that's written, Mr. Lanchak, that doesn't prohibit a 7 licensee from accessing the JDE open code, correct? 8 Well, I believe the injunction's purpose was to prohibit 9 unlawful conduct. 10 Well, let me just read it. "Rimini Street shall not copy or access JD 11 12 Edwards software source code to carry out development 13 and testing of software updates." 14 So that only applies to Rimini Street, correct? 15 MR. LIVERSIDGE: Objection, calls for a legal 16 conclusion. 17 THE COURT: Sustained. And I would also state 18 that the words "or access" have been stricken from the 19 injunction. 20 MR. HILL: Thank you, your Honor. 21 BY MR. HILL: 2.2 But as you read this, this doesn't apply to a licensee, 23 correct? It only applies to Rimini Street. 24 I see the words there, but, as I said, I believe the 25 injunction is meant to prohibit unlawful conduct, and unlawful

is unlawful. 1 2 Okay. In your interpretation -- well, assuming Oracle's 3 interpretation, have you seen any JD Edwards license that prohibits the licensee from accessing the JDE -- from copying 4 5 the JDE open code? 6 Repeat it, please. 7 Under Oracle's interpretation of source code, have 8 you seen any license that prohibits the licensee from 9 accessing what you call JDE open code? 10 I believe the licenses support the licensees and their 11 affiliates in supporting -- or in accessing and modifying and 12 copying that open layer of code, as I've said. 13 MR. HILL: No further questions, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Redirect examination? 15 MR. LIVERSIDGE: Just very briefly, your Honor. 16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. LIVERSIDGE: 18 Mr. Lanchak, do you recall that counsel asked you about 19 whether the terms open and closed code were reflected in the 20 licenses? 21 Yes, I do. Α 2.2 And you indicated that the actual terms open and closed 23 were not used. Do you recall that? 24 I do recall that. 25 But are the concepts around these open and closed layers

```
1
     of code reflected in the licenses?
 2
          They are. And the point I want to make about open and
 3
     closed, they're mere labels. We can call opened and closed
     whatever we want.
 4
 5
               But the concepts -- which is what -- what is the
 6
     important point here, are reflected in the licenses as we
 7
     discussed.
 8
          And we looked at one of the licenses for JD Edwards, and
 9
     do the licenses have a prohibition on decompiling, accessing,
10
     and ultimately copying the closed layer of code that you've
11
     identified?
12
          That is correct.
13
          And is there any prohibition that you've seen in the
14
     licenses on copying the open code?
15
               There is no prohibition against that I've seen
16
     in the licenses.
17
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: Nothing further, your Honor.
                   THE COURT: Anything further?
18
19
                   MR. HILL: Nothing further, your Honor.
20
                   THE COURT: All right.
21
                   That will conclude the testimony of Mr. Lanchak.
2.2
                   Let me inquire, what do you next anticipate on
23
     behalf of Rimini?
24
                   MR. LIVERSIDGE: Your Honor, my understanding is
25
    we have a few housekeeping matters to take up and to clean up
```

```
1
     before we close, and then we'll be at the end of our case.
 2
                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 3
                   And Mr. Smith do you know, at this point in
     time -- I'm sorry, Mr. Hill, whether any rebuttal is
 4
 5
     anticipated on behalf of Oracle?
 6
                   MR. HILL: Yes. Oracle intends to call back
 7
    Ms. Frederiksen-Cross.
 8
                   THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you.
 9
                   We will take our morning recess at this time.
10
     We will reconvene at 10:40 or shortly thereafter.
11
                           (A recess was taken.)
12
                   THE COURT: Have a seat, please.
13
                   The record will show we are reconvened after our
14
     morning break.
15
                   And, Mr. McCracken, I see that you're up at bat
     at this time so go ahead.
16
17
                   MR. MCCRACKEN: Yes, good morning, your Honor.
18
     We just have a few evidentiary housekeeping matters before
19
     Rimini rests its case.
20
                   THE COURT: Okay.
21
                   MR. McCRACKEN: The first is that yesterday the
2.2
     Court reserved ruling on Oracle Exhibit 68, but at this time
23
     both parties have agreed that that should come into evidence,
24
     and so we would offer Oracle Exhibit 68.
25
                   THE COURT: All right. It is admitted.
```

```
1
     appreciate your doing that.
 2
                          (Plaintiff's Document Exhibit 68 received
                           in evidence.)
 3
                   MR. McCRACKEN:
                                   The second issue, your Honor, is
 4
     we have DTX-46, which is an excerpt of Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's
 5
     deposition testimony that was read into the record on
 6
     Wednesday, so we would offer DTX-46. There's no objection
 7
     from Oracle.
                   THE COURT: All right. It's admitted as well.
 8
 9
     Thank you.
10
                          (Defendant's Exhibit 46 received in
                           evidence.)
                   MR. McCRACKEN: The third issue is with regard
11
12
     to DTX-733, which is a copy of the Mathew Stava declaration
13
     that we've heard testimony about. Another copy of that is
14
     already admitted, which is DTX-716, and so we'd offer DTX-733,
15
     and there's no objection to that.
16
                   THE COURT: All right. It is admitted.
17
                          (Defendant's Document Exhibit 733
                           received in evidence.)
18
                               Is 716 already in evidence?
                   THE COURT:
19
                   MR. McCRACKEN: Yes, that's my understanding,
20
     your Honor.
21
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay. Go ahead, please.
2.2
                   MR. McCRACKEN: And then, finally, we would
23
     offer DTX-740, which is a copy of the transcript of the
24
     deposition of Buffy Ransom that was played in court -- was
25
     that Friday? Monday? In any event, it was played in court,
```

```
1
     and there's no objection to that.
 2
                   THE COURT: All right. It's admitted.
 3
                           (Defendant's Exhibit 740 received in
                           evidence.)
 4
                   MR. McCRACKEN: And with those resolved, your
 5
     Honor, Rimini rests subject to Oracle's rebuttal case.
 6
                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much,
 7
    Mr. McCracken.
 8
                   MR. McCRACKEN:
                                   Thank you.
 9
                   THE COURT: Mr. Smith, are you at bat?
10
                   MR. SMITH:
                               I'm at bat, your Honor. We recall
11
     Ms. Frederiksen-Cross to the stand.
12
                   THE COURT: All right, thank you.
13
                   MR. SMITH: Welcome back, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross.
14
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Thank you.
15
                       BARBARA FREDERIKSEN-CROSS,
       called as a rebuttal witness on behalf of the Plaintiff,
                previously sworn, testified as follows:
16
17
                          DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
     BY MR. SMITH:
19
          Let's get to it. Do you recall Professor Astrachan's
20
     testimony that the Oracle copyrighted files and documents
21
     found on Rimini's systems were isolated?
2.2
      Α
          I recall that testimony, yes.
23
          And do you recall that he testified that he called these
     files and documentation isolated either because they were few
24
25
     in number or because they are separated from the PeopleSoft
```

- 1 environments?
- 2 A I do recall, yes.
- Do you believe the Oracle files and documentation found on Rimini systems were isolated in number?
- 5 A No, I do not.
- O Do you have a demonstrative showing the number of files,
- 7 Oracle copyrighted files, that you found on Rimini systems?
- 8 A Yes, I do.
- 9 MR. SMITH: And with your Honor's permission, we would show slide 2 of her demonstratives which I have provided a copy for the Court, too.
- 12 THE COURT: All right. You may do so.
- 13 BY MR. SMITH:

21

2.2

23

24

- Q Can you walk us through this slide and your analysis of the copyrighted files.
- 16 A Yes, just to refresh the testimony I gave the other day,
  17 we initially searched for indicia of documents that contained
  18 Oracle copyright. So this would be Oracle or PeopleSoft,
  19 PeopleTools, JDE documents.
  - We did so using a text-based search that just looks for the proximity of copyright with those words. That research revealed 4,481 documents.
  - And then just to reduce that to a manageable number for a more detailed review, we also filtered to include dot txt files because we had seen evidence, for instance, of files

being renamed to txt when they're being transmitted to SalesForce.

Similarly, we filtered for files beginning with OOP, because that was used in some of Oracle's filing name conventions, and we -- that yielded -- after that pass of filtering, we had 1139 documents. This excluded .pdf files and certain other types of files as well.

- Q Okay. So with respect to the 1,139 documents, that excluded .pdf files?
- 10 A Yes, unless they met the OOP.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- 11 Q And were other types of documents also excluded by that 12 initial filtering process?
- A Yes. This was intended to exclude things like HTML files, for instance, that would have been the results of someone printing a support page, for instance, that was publicly available but had an Oracle copyright.

And, similarly, if you had copied from a page like that into a Word document, you know, because we didn't include the Word file types, that would have been excluded as well.

- Q And then can you describe the further filtering process that's referenced here.
- A Yes. Then we filtered specifically for the file extensions that would have been related to source code as well.
  - Q Okay. And so Professor Astrachan has opined that 844 of

1 the 934 documents that resulted from your filtering process 2 were uploaded to SalesForce by clients. Do you recall 3 evidence of that? 4 I recall his testimony that he was told that and had 5 relied upon that number. 6 And do you know how that number was determined by 7 Professor Astrachan? 8 It was through interview with Mr. Butler who I understand 9 to be a Rimini employee. 10 Now, assuming that that figure is accurate, that 844 of 11 the 934 documents were uploaded to SalesForce by clients, how 12 many documents does that leave, based upon your search, that 13 were not uploaded by clients? 14 That leaves an additional 90 documents. 15 I would like to show you page 929, line 24, to page 930, 16 line 7, of the transcript from day five, which was Professor Astrachan's testimony. And he was asked: 17 18 "Do you consider those 19 files sent to 19 Rimini by clients to be isolated?" 20 His answer was, "Yes. I call them isolated 21 because they're not part of any environment. 2.2 environment from which they came were the client's 23 environment. Rimini has no environments. So these PeopleSoft files are isolated. They can't be 24 25 executed because Rimini has no PeopleSoft

environments. They can't be run. They can't be used because they are isolated from the environments from which they came."

Do you agree with that testimony.

A I think it ignores the fact that there are other forms of use than running the software, for instance, looking at the files in order to diagnosis a problem, or, if it's a description of an Oracle fix, in order to understand, you know, what Oracle was fixing and how it was fixed.

So I disagree with the characterization as these being not -- not useable.

- Q And do you have a demonstrative highlighting Rimini's use of certain documents and files?
- 14 A Yes, I do, with the Court's permission.
- 15 Q And we'd like to display slide 3.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Can you briefly explain this slide and how the exemplar files that you found on Rimini systems were used.

A These are files that I spoke about in my testimony a few days ago. Psptaxdt.dms, this file was uploaded to Rimini's system. It was opened, and the change log was viewed in order to assess the version so that Rimini could help a customer resolve a problem.

The PeopleSoft documentation that was sent through
SalesForce from -- by Texas General's -- Texas General -Texas Children's Hospital, sorry, was then loaded to a share

file.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

So it was initially sent to Tom Glazer, or provided to Tom Glazer as an attachment, and then later moved to the share file on Rimini's system presumably because someone thought it was useful.

With respect to Evergreen Support, the file psptcalc.lis, was a program listing that was provided by a client to Rimini, and the SalesForce document indicates that Rimini was able to identify the problem in one of its files after reviewing this listing from the Oracle file that happened to have an inclusion for that Rimini file.

And then, finally, the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center tax files, again, the record shows that they were reviewed for the purposes of diagnosing a problem with the calendar year and where it was being picked up from in the database.

MR. SMITH: Okay. We can take that down.

## BY MR. SMITH:

- Q Do you recall Mr. MacKereth's testimony from yesterday that the SalesForce records you analyzed were flagged for quarantined in some fashion?
- A I do recall that testimony, yes.
- 23 Q Was yesterday the first time you heard of any such
  24 practice by Rimini with regard to the files that you discussed
  25 in your prior testimony?

- A Well, in Mr. Astrachan's report, he had said he had been provided information by Mr. Butler in a verbal conversation that there had been some kind of quarantine, but yesterday was the first evidence I had ever seen presented that was represented to be associated with that quarantining.
- Q And did you review the production history of the SalesForce documents in this case following Mr. MacKereth's testimony from yesterday?
- 9 A Yes, I did.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

2.2

- 10 Q And did you reach any conclusions based upon that review?
  - A Yeah. It appears that the -- assuming, for a moment, that that date change does, in fact, reflect the date that these documents were quarantined, it appears that they were quarantined at a point in time after Rimini had agreed to produce those documents but a couple of months before they were actually produced.
  - Q And do you know when Rimini agreed to provide the SalesForce tables that you reviewed in this case?
- A My recollection is that that was August 5th or 6th of 20 2019.
  - Q And do you recall when the SalesForce records that you reviewed in this case were actually produced by Rimini?
- 23 A That was later in October.
- 24 Q And how many months after the injunction was issued were
  25 the SalesForce records offered to be produced by Rimini in

- 1 this case?
- 2 A The original 2016 injunction or the confirmation of that
- 3 in November?
- 4 Q Let's go from the November 2018 date.
- 5 A That would be, I think, seven or eight months.
- And let me move on -- well, let me ask you one final question with respect to the SalesForce records.
  - We saw records yesterday that were indicated to be modified by Ms. Maurya Priyadarshi. Do you recall that?
- 10 A I do.

in some way?

8

9

14

20

- And do you understand the dates reflected in the

  SalesForce records, which I believe ranged from August 23rd to

  28 of 2019, to reflect the date when she modified those files
- 15 A That was my understanding from the testimony provided.
- 16 Q I'd now like to talk to you about the evidence presented 17 in this case regarding violations 4, 2, 3 and 10, which I 18 think have been loosely grouped together as kind of the 19 cross-use violations.
  - Are there some general rebuttal points that you would like to make regarding each of these violations?
- 22 A Yes, there are.
- 23 Q And do you have a demonstrative outlining these general rebuttal points?
- 25 A **Yes, I do.**

-1358<del>-</del>

If we could show slide 4. 1 MR. SMITH: 2 BY MR. SMITH: 3 Are these your general rebuttal points? 4 Α Yes. Can you explain these briefly, and then we'll get into 5 6 greater detail in a moment. 7 Sure. With respect to the first point, you know, it is 8 my understanding that even if a particular client were in 9 scope, that the injunction prohibits the reuse of work done in 10 that client's environment to support some other licensee, that 11 the injunction really makes clear that it's solely in support 12 of a particular client's use that their environment can be 13 used. And then how about number 2. 14 15 There was some rather muddy testimony, I felt, yesterday 16 that seemed to conflate the delivery of software -- or of an 17 update to a client with development in that client's 18 environment, and this specifically focused on some of the logs 19 that were discussed where the file transfer and -- and the 20 creation of the upload folders, and so I'd like the 21 opportunity to clear that up. 2.2 Okay. So let's talk about your first general rebuttal 23 opinion regarding cross-use. 24 Do violations number 4 and 2 regarding Spherion, 25 Smead and Matheson Trucking illustrate this point?

- 1 A Yes, they do.
- 2 Q And do you recall that violations 2 and 4 concern the
- 3 form 940A, which involved credit reductions for businesses
- 4 | with employees in the US Virgin Islands?
- 5 A I do, yes.
- 6 Q Do you recall testimony to the effect that because the
- 7 HCM200049 update for this credit reduction issue involved a
- 8 | federal tax form, all states and clients were in scope to
- 9 receive the update?
- 10 A I recall that testimony.
- 11 Q And do you recall Mr. Benge's testimony that because the
- 12 | City of Eugene was part of a group of clients that were in
- scope to receive the update, the update was first developed in
- 14 | City of Eugene?
- 15 A I recall that testimony, yes.
- 16 Q Do you agree that the City of Eugene was in scope to
- 17 receive the HCM200049 update at the time Mr. Don Sheffield
- 18 | first went into the environment associated with the City of
- 19 | Eugene, and performed testing of that update?
- 20 A Not with respect to the specific problem that was being
- 21 | worked on at that point in time.
- 22 Q And do you recall Professor Astrachan's demonstrative
- 23 regarding this timeline?
- 24 A Yes, I do.
- 25 MR. SMITH: And if we could show slide 5.

## 1 BY MR. SMITH:

- 2 Q And this is DDX-559. Do you recognize this as the demonstrative from Professor Astrachan's direct testimony?
- 4 | A I do, yes.
- 5 Q Was this timeline accurate in your opinion?
  - A In my opinion, it's both incomplete and inaccurate.
  - Q Have you created your own rebuttal timeline?
- 8 A Yes, I have.
- 9 MR. SMITH: And if we could show slide 6.
- 10 BY MR. SMITH:

6

7

20

21

2.2

23

- 11 Q Can you please explain your timeline with respect to this violation, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross.
- 13 A Yes. What I think is significant that was omitted was
  14 that well in advance of the activities that were being
  15 discussed in that specific fix for the records we were looking
  16 at yesterday, the IRS had already announced that that change
  17 for 940A in the new box would apply only to businesses that
  18 had -- or only to work being done in the US Virgin Islands,
  19 and so that was in November 28th of 2018.

Subsequent to that, if we look at the Jira records, we see that in January 15th, Ms. Gardner set the scope of the Form 940, therefore, to include just Spherion, the client SPH.

- Q And who is Laurie Gardner, to your recollection?
- A My recollection is that she was the manager of the business analysts group, and I don't remember her specific

title.

2.2

But she was the person who, as I understand it, would be authorized to make those determinations of scope, and to update the Jira record based on the facts that the business analysts had determined in reviewing publications such as this IRS announcement.

Okay. And then what happened next?

A On January 24th, rather than the 25th -- and this is the one that I feel is in error with respect to Mr. Astrachan's timeline that he showed, but the communications we reviewed showed that Don Sheffield had already indicated on the 24th of January before the scope got changed back to US -- so while it was still only Spherion that he was testing in the City of Eugene.

- Q Okay. And then the scope was later changed after that?
- A Right. On the 25th he changes the scope to the US rather than Spherion to facilitate his distribution of that fix.
  - Q At any point in time in these proceedings, have you heard or seen any evidence that the City of Eugene requested or needed delivery of the HCM200049 update in January of 2019?
- 21 A No, I have not.
  - Q Let's assume for the sake of argument that the City of
    Eugene was in scope to receive the HCM200049 update as of
    January 24th, 2019, when Mr. Sheffield indicated that he
    tested that update in the environment associated with the City

- 1 of Eugene, would that change your opinions in any way?
- A Not with respect to whether or not that action appears to violate the injunction.
- 4 Q And why is that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

A Well, again, as I understand the language of the injunction, it prevents testing and problem diagnosis, troubleshooting, in one client's environment on behalf of other clients.

And so -- at least as I understand the wording of this injunction, that would be something that was prohibited to then subsequently distribute that solution more broadly on behalf -- so that it was for the benefit of other clients because now it's not work done solely on behalf of the City of Eugene.

- Q So is it your opinion that Rimini's development work in client A, for example -- in the environment of client A, for example, must be solely for the support of client A?
- 18 A That's my understanding of the injunction, yes.
- 19 Q And what is that understanding based upon?
- 20 A Well, I think we discussed the other day paragraph 4, for 21 instance, of the injunction with respect to PeopleSoft, and 22 paragraph 8 of the injunction.
- 23 | Q You mean paragraph 6?
- 24 A Sorry, yes, paragraph 6.
- MR. SMITH: Matt, can we display 4 and 6.

```
BY MR. SMITH:
 1
 2
          And so what is the language within this -- within these
 3
     two paragraphs that you're relying upon?
 4
          Well, in paragraph 4, you have the language that,
      Α
 5
                  "Rimini shall not reproduce, prepare
 6
          derivative works from, or use specific licensees --
 7
          specific licensees' PeopleSoft software or
 8
          documentation, other than to support the specific
 9
          licensee's own internal operations."
10
                   So I find that language significant there.
11
                   With respect to 16, again, the prohibition
12
          is,
13
                  "Reproducing, preparing derivative works
14
          from, or using PeopleSoft software or documentation
15
          on one licensee's computer system to support,
          troubleshoot, or perform development or testing for
16
17
          any other licensee."
18
          Okay. And I think you said paragraph 16, but I think you
     were referring to --
19
20
          Six, yes, Sorry.
21
          Okay. But you would agree with me, wouldn't you, that
2.2
     neither of these paragraphs use the word solely.
23
          The word solely doesn't appear in these. It talks about
24
     a specific licensee's environment for the benefit of other
25
     licensees."
```

- 1 Q Is there is other language in the injunction that you
  2 rely upon to support your opinion that work for one client
  3 must be solely for purposes of that client?
- A Yeah. This was the PeopleSoft specific prohibition, but in paragraphs above that, in the Court's injunction, the Court used the word "solely" specifically. That would be, I think, in paragraph 2A.
- 8 MR. SMITH: Okay. Can we take a look at 9 paragraph 2A.
- 10 BY MR. SMITH:
- 11 Q And take a look at this and tell us if this is the 12 language you're referring to.
- 13 A That's correct, "Unless solely in connection with the work for a specific customer."
  - Q Okay. Now I would like to turn to a discussion of the issue of scope with regard to violation number 3, and that's the Johnson Controls W2 form issue. Do you recall that?
- 18 A I do.

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

- Q With regard to violation number 3 and the values associated with that print format box that was tested in the City of Eugene, did you see or hear any evidence that the City of Eugene was affected by this print format problem?
- A No. I had seen no evidence that they had reported any problem with that, or any evidence, even after the fact, that they were necessarily affected by that.

```
1
                   MR. SMITH: Matt, I'd like to pull up Defense
 2
     Exhibit 302.
 3
     BY MR. SMITH:
          And, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, directing your attention to
 4
 5
     the second page, I believe, of this exhibit, near the bottom
 6
     there's an indication that the issue experienced by -- it's
 7
     the second line down in this e-mail.
 8
               There's an indication that the issue experienced by
 9
     Johnson Controls, quote, "Could be a problem" --
10
                  "Could be a potential problem for all new
11
          clients switching from tax960us to rsi960us who have
12
          left the formatting field blank."
13
                   In your opinion, does the injunction allow
14
     Rimini to use the PeopleSoft environment associated with the
15
     City of Eugene, to test a fix for Johnson Controls, simply
16
     because the problem, quote, "could be a potential problem for
17
     all new clients"?
18
          Again, because they're doing that testing in order to
     test something for hypothetical other clients, it seems to me
19
20
     that that would be outside what was permitted under the
21
     injunction.
2.2
          Okay. Then I'd like to direct your attention back to
23
     Oracle Exhibit 27, OREX 27, and the second page where
24
     Mr. Sheffield included a screenshot from the PeopleSoft user
25
     interface.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Does it matter, for purposes of your opinion, whether the City of Eugene already had this print format of B999999.99 in its PeopleSoft systems at the time Mr. Sheffield entered into the system, or that he applied that on the date that he tested the fix in the City of Eugene environment? So just to be clear, you're asking whether it would affect my opinion whether they already had it or whether they were doing it on the fly as they were trying to figure out this problem. No. Yeah, that's correct. That was my question. And the answer is? No, it doesn't change my opinion either way. And why is that? Well, if they already had it, then they're making reference to this environment in order to understand and

reference to this environment in order to understand and troubleshoot the problem to see what's different between the two environments.

If, on the other hand, they were trying to work through the problem, again, they would be trying to work through that problem in the context of an issue that a different client had reported, and, in either case, the City of Eugene's environment was being used in order to troubleshoot and resolve a problem for another customer.

Q Okay. I'd like to return back to slide 4 of your

demonstratives and talk about your second rebuttal point.

You indicated that there was some testimony that you found to be muddled regarding the distinction between delivery and development for a particular client; is that right?

- A Yeah. There's one thing I would like to add in my previous answer, though, if I may.
- Q Sure.

2.2

A One of the things that struck me as particularly interesting in that correspondence about the change to box 17 was, you know, this is a very simple change -- a comparatively simple change. It may not have been simple to figure out, but it was a simple change.

But, if you look at the correspondence in that e-mail, this is an instance where it's very clear that you can't say this was know-how of what the fix was, because they spent several days trying to work out a fix for the client who is having the problem.

Had this already been a known solution, even if it was already in Eugene's environment, they would not have needed to spend that time to be able to communicate to the client.

So this is an example -- you know, there's been a lot talk about know-how and what's know-how, and this is an example where I think it illustrates that, very simply, that this is a small change, but was something that was already

```
1
     evidence that they were struggling to know how to fix this
 2
     problem, and actually using that environment to -- the
 3
     environment of the City of Eugene, to try to determine what an
     appropriate fix for the other client would be.
 4
 5
          So are you referring to the fact that this support case
 6
     for Johnson Controls, I think was opened a day or two earlier,
 7
     and Mr. Sheffield tried to apply different fixes before
 8
     arriving at this B999999.99 fix?
 9
          Yeah, that's exactly --
10
                   MR. McCRACKEN: Objection.
                                               Leading.
11
                   THE WITNESS: But, that's exactly the point.
                                                                  Ιf
12
     you look in this e-mail, starting at the beginning of the
13
     change --
14
                   THE COURT: Wait.
                                      Let me stop you. We have an
15
     objection that the question was leading.
16
                   I'll allow the question because it appears to be
17
     inviting an explanation from her -- at least that appears that
18
     she was giving an explanation, so I will allow it with that
19
     understanding.
                   THE WITNESS: Yeah, if you go to earlier parts
20
     of this e-mail chain where you see the first days starting
21
2.2
     at -- yeah, the bottom of the document. Okay, one page up.
23
                   You see that the initial correspondence took
24
     place on the 23rd, and the client was, you know, "We really
25
     need this fixed. There's a problem here that we're having."
```

1 And then if you go back through time here, there 2 are some, you know, proposed solutions. 3 If you go one more page forward in time -- so, yeah, if you could blow that one up. So they're asking, you 4 5 know, what are they using to print it, what program are they 6 using? What are they on? 7 And then move forward in time a little bit 8 farther. 9 So here, they're starting to talk about what they've done for some other client, HCR, and that maybe that's 10 11 going to be a fix, and this point in time it's still focused 12 on the box 14 fix. 13 And then go forward another roll in the e-mail 14 chain. 15 And so, again, they're still struggling to fix 16 the template. They're trying to change the underlying 17 template as opposed to the program at this point, And so this 18 is on the 24th, so a day later. 19 And now go forward a little bit. 20 And here's where they say they made a change in 21 the JHN environment, maybe that's going to fix it for them. 2.2 It also notes that -- you know, it gives some 23 additional information about interacting with the form fields 24 in this e-mail, but that's on the 24th again. 25

## BY MR. SMITH:

2.2

- Q And the change -- is it your recollection, did the change to the templates work?
- A The change to the templates did not -- well, it fixed one problem, but it didn't fix the other problem. It didn't fix the problem with the new box that was related to the Virgin Islands.

And so several days have elapsed here as they try to struggle to fix this. So obviously it wasn't a solution that was already understood at that point.

- Q Okay. So just to summarize this, why is it your opinion that the work performed by Mr. Sheffield in the City of Eugene environment on January 23rd -- or 25th of -- 24th or 25th of 2019, doesn't merely constitute the use of know-how?
- A Well, it appears that Mr. Sheffield had the know-how to know, for instance, where parameters are defined. But he did not know with certainty that that was the specific fix here at the outset of the problem or he would have communicated that.

And with respect to City of Eugene, whether they had the variable already, and he was comparing Eugene's configuration to the client reporting the problem, or whether he was going there to test some things and see if this would fix it, in either case, it's apparent he was using the City of Eugene's environment in order to help troubleshoot and come up with a fix for a different client --

- 1 | Q Okay.
- 2 A -- which I understand to be prohibited under the
- 3 injunction.
- Q Okay. Now, returning to your demonstrative slide 4, and
- 5 you indicated, I think earlier today, that there was some
- 6 | muddled testimony regarding the distinction between delivery
- 7 and development. What did you mean by that?
- 8 A Well, I heard testimony that the Apply Update logs, for
- 9 instance, were evidence of testing, and I disagree very
- 10 strongly with that, those logs provide evidence of delivery of
- 11 | the solution to an environment.
- But I've looked at many, many, many of these logs,
- and what they show is that essentially the package of the
- 14 | software that is a particular update is delivered and
- confirmation that that delivery was correct, so, in other
- words, that the right objects were in the package and that
- 17 | they are in the right place, but there is no testing shown in
- 18 | those logs.
- 19 And I think there's a clear distinction between
- 20 | sending something to a client and actually testing in that
- 21 | client's environment.
- 22 Q Okay. And does violation number two with regard to
- 23 | Matheson Trucking illustrate this point?
- 24 A It does.
- 25 Q If we could take a look at Oracle Exhibit 22, page 3 of

4, do you recall this exhibit, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, whereby 1 2 Mr. Benge indicated to Mr. Pringle, quote, 3 "Hi, Tim. I have absolutely no indication that HCM 20049 was developed or tested yet for MAT. 4 5 Has it been?" 6 Now, despite this e-mail, do you recall hearing 7 from Mr. Benge that this update was, in fact, developed in 8 Matheson's environment? 9 I recall that he testified to that, yes. 10 I'd like to display the hearing transcript from day 4, 11 page 804, lines 9 through 21. 12 And is this the testimony that you were referencing, 13 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, as being muddled? 14 And here he's talking about the part of that 15 delivery record that shows the creation of the update folders, 16 that is to say creating a folder on the system that you're 17 going to be putting the update into, as evidence of testing. 18 And, again, that to me is very clearly a part of the 19 set up for the delivery, and he goes on to say, you know, they ran the Transfer Files utility and moved the files from 20 21 Rimini's system to Matheson's development folders. 2.2 So they weren't on Matheson already, and they were 23 just being moved there, and this log that he's discussing --24 I've reviewed that log several times. There is nothing in

that log to indicate development or testing there, merely that

25

1 | the package was delivered there.

2.2

Q Okay. So with respect to Mr. Benge's testimony here, does the act of creating update folders to get the folder structures all set up in the development environment for Matheson, including collecting the before source code for the program, have anything to do with development?

A No, that's just a part of the delivery process. They create a set of folders where the code is going to be delivered.

They create a before folder and take the client's current version of the program and put it in the before folder so that once they have delivered the solution, they are able to verify that what should be in the after folder, if you will, which is also created as a part of this process, is the correct version of the file. But, it's not testing the file, it's just a verification of delivery of the content.

- Q Does the creation of update folders, including the collecting the before source code for the program, have anything to do with testing of this update?
- A Only to the extent that you would test the update after delivery, that that would be a, you know, a predicate step for the delivery is to bring that content down to where you're going to be testing it.
- Q I think you mentioned this already, but did you review the automation framework database records that were referenced

by Mr. Benge in this testimony?

2.2

- A Yes. He mentioned specifically the portion of the automation framework that creates the update folders, and then a little bit farther beyond where you just highlighted, the part that does the transfer files, that is to say that then moves the folders from Rimini's system to those -- or moves the update from Rimini's system to the folders that were just created.
- Q Do these records referenced by Mr. Benge in his testimony confirm any development or testing of the HCM200049 update in the Matheson Trucking environment prior to January 28th of 2019?
- A I would want to look at the date specifically on that e-mail, but it certainly didn't confirm any testing prior to the date of that e-mail.
- Q Now, if Rimini had developed this update that we're talking about, the HCM200049, in the environment of Matheson Trucking, would there have been any need for Rimini to deliver the update with the automation framework as referenced by Mr. Benge?
- A Well, that was the point I made before. If it was already there, you wouldn't need to move it there to check it out there. If they developed it in that environment, you would expect that it would be in that environment in the developmental folders.

Okay. A couple of more questions. Do you recall 1 2 Ms. Davenport's testimony that there is no quality assurance 3 testing at what Rimini calls informal updates? I do recall that testimony, yes. 4 5 Based upon your review of Rimini's postinjunction support 6 practices, is Rimini's provision of informal updates a common 7 occurrence in your opinion? 8 Α It appears to be. Anytime there's a bug to be fixed or 9 the customer needs some customization, it might result in an 10 informal update if they need it more quickly than waiting for 11 the future formal update. 12 Okay. I'd like to move to violation number 5 which has 13 been the subject of a significant amount of testimony. 14 Do you recall Professor Astrachan's testimony 15 regarding the psptarry.cbl, and rspcmpay.cbl files? 16 Yes, I do. Α 17 Was there anything surprising to you about the 18 methodology that Professor Astrachan used to compare the 19 Oracle file with the Rimini file? 20 There were a couple of things that surprised me about One is that it appears he applied a different 21 2.2 methodology or a different process here than he used in the 23 Rimini II matter. 24 I mean, the steps he articulates are different in

what he says -- what he identifies as constraints or things

25

- that his filtration would filter out were a different set than before.
  - Q Okay. Anything else? You said a couple of things.
- A Yeah. There was some vagueness in his -- is it possible to put up the list that he used in this case?
- 6 Q Sure. So let's show slide DDX-512 which is already up.

Do you understand these to be the elements that

Professor Astrachan used for constraint filtering and analytic

dissection in his testimony in this case?

10 A **Yes.** 

3

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 11 Q And how many elements are there?
- 12 A **Five.**
- 13 Q And now I'd like to show you paragraph 205 of his Rimini
  14 II rebuttal report -- and Matt will pull that up for us.
  - And are these the elements Professor Astrachan claimed -- strike that.

Are these the elements that Professor Astrachan claimed to be needed for exclusion for purposes of substantial similarity analysis in the Rimini II case?

- A Yes, I understand these to be the elements he had listed there as required for analytic dissection.
- 22 | Q And how many elements are there?
- 23 A There are eight in this particular list.
- 24 Q In your opinion, did Professor Astrachan include elements 25 for exclusion during his testimony in this proceeding that are

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- not included in the prior list of elements he's referenced in paragraph 205 of his Rimini II report?
  - A He did. If we could go back to the list that he referred to in his testimony.

So there's a couple things that I don't see here in the other list. And I don't know if it's possible to put these up side-by-side, or one atop the other.

But, for instance, here he lists code constrained by the syntax of the language, and I didn't see reference specifically to syntax of the language in the list he used in Rimini II.

- Q Let's see if we can get paragraph 205 up side-by-side with the demonstrative from this case.
- A Yeah, Matt, we only just need the list from paragraph 205

  I think.
  - Q Okay. So please proceed, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross. I think you were talking about item one from Professor Astrachan's demonstrative code constrained by the syntax.
  - A Yeah. He didn't appear to be citing to language syntax in his analytic dissection he used in Rimini II.

And then looking at this list, I think he mentions elements constrained by function, code constrained by software function, I think that's essentially the same thing in different words in all likelihood, similarly logic and efficiency.

2.2

But then you get to code constrained by standard programming terms, and I don't see any reference in the other -- in the other list to standard programming terms, nor do I think that this is something that would be particularly reproducible unless you identify the language and what terms you're talking about.

So there's -- this would be a difficult standard to apply, I think.

And then the code constrained by standard development conventions, again, I think here, while I don't disagree that you would want to look at whether common coding conventions are being used, I don't think that in and of itself their use is necessarily dispositive of anything.

And you would want to look at them in the context of the software because, if you're using a coding convention, for instance, from one language, in a different language where nobody does that, that would be something that I would want to look at.

And similarly the -- you know, just saying standard development conventions without identifying what those are makes it very difficult to reproduce this work, and to perform the analysis again.

Q Okay. Regardless of whether Professor Astrachan's methodology involves five unprotectible elements, or eight unprotectible elements, do you agree with his general analytic

dissection methodology?

2.2

- A Again, I don't, because it seems to be adapted to the specific instance of the matter before the Court here today, rather than being a more broadly applied technique, and he didn't cite any reference that I'm aware of for the use of the specific steps he chose in either of these cases.
- Q Okay. Let's talk about some of his specific criticisms.
  - So, first, Professor Astrachan complained about the fact that you did not conduct your analysis using Oracle and Rimini files, and this, again, is the psptarry file, and the rspcmpay.cbl file.

He complained that you didn't conduct your analysis using a fixed-width format. Do you recall that?

- A I recall him discussing that, yes.
- 15 Q And what is a fixed-width format?
  - A What I understand him to be referring is to have compared the two side-by-side using a fixed-width font such that each character would necessarily occupy the same amount of real estate on a line so you're comparing 80 character lines to 80 character lines.

But with a proportional font, a W, for instance, is -- takes up much more real estate than, say, the lower case i, and so you can't see as clearly the alignment of things within the code.

Whereas if you used a fixed-width font, those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

24

- columns will line up vertically. If you put the code one over the other, you're going to see the exact same alignment throughout. Okav. So after hearing Professor Astrachan's testimony, did you repeat your analysis using a fixed-width format? Α Yes. And did that analysis change your opinions in any way? The only thing it changed is I would retract the comment about the one orphan flower on the end of that one comment because after I looked at then in fixed-width format, I see that they do both occur in column 72. Okay. Was there anything else that you noticed after conducting your fixed-width format analysis? Actually, I noticed a couple of other similarities that are an unconstrained visual aspects of how the code is presented, that is to say, other unconstrained issues with respect to alignment. Okay. Let's stick with the fixed-width format here for 19 one more minute. Did you assess Professor Astrachan's testimony that the Rimini flower boxes uniformly start with a back slash asterisk rather than an asterisk? I'm sorry. Are you asking was I aware of that testimony
- 25 Did you consider it?

or did I --

A I considered it, but it's not accurate.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q Okay. So let me refresh everyone's recollection by showing the transcript at page 951, lines 7 through 18.

And in this transcript portion, Professor Astrachan testified that they uniformly, the beginning of the flower boxes started with a slash asterisk on the top line.

Do you agree with that testimony?

A No, I don't. I mean, he goes on at the bottom of the page here to say the convention is followed throughout the file, but that is inaccurate.

Some of the comment boxes in the Rimini file start with the slash asterisk, some start on the first line of the comment box just with an asterisk.

- Q And do you have a demonstrative highlighting some of those examples?
- A I do. I think there's actually a couple of them.
- Q Could you walk us through, briefly, slides 9 and 10 from your demonstratives.
  - A Yes. Just to orient here, so when we are looking at the bottom box on the left, you see that the first flower box starts with a slash asterisk. That's what we're talking about. The slash is on the first line of the top of the box, and then if you look at the bottom of the flower box, it's all asterisks.

But if you look down the page to the SQL

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

communication, that line starts with -- the top line starts with a flower box, and this is on the Oracle code.

When you look across to the Rimini code, you see the exact same two comment boxes with the exact same flower box annotation style, the exact same comments, and, of course, the exact same alignment of those comments within the flower box.

- Q Okay. And so why is this significant to you that these two files have consistent different starting characters for flower boxes?
- A Well, it's one more example of a difference that, if it occurred once in a program, might arguably be considered to be, you know, coincidence, you know, somebody mistyped or something, but, we see several of these throughout the program.

And, again, it's not obviously the process -- or the product of this particular developer's habitual practice because they're inconsistent with it.

And it's another unexplained similarity between the two code files between the Oracle psptarry file and the rscmpay file.

- Q Did you discover other unexplained similarities after conducting your fixed-width analysis?
- 23 A There are several, yes.
- 24 Q And could you describe those for us, please.
- 25 A Well, for instance, if you -- just on the screen that we

2.2

have up right now, you'll notice that the word copy is aligned roughly under the "U" in "function" on both sides.

That is to say copy occupies this -- it has been aligned to the same alignment.

Now, I don't dispute that programmers like to kind of line those things up, it makes the program a little visually cleaner. But there's no constraint on where they line them up.

I heard Professor Astrachan say that Cobol is a column-driven language, but that's really only true with respect to the first six characters or a sequence.

The seventh character can be used to indicate continuation or a comment, and then columns 8 through 11 are reserved for certain types of things can start in those columns.

But then once you get into the main segment of the line, until you get to column 72, there are really no requirements of any form for how you line things up within that real estate.

Column 72 on are then required -- are then reserved for other things within the language like some machine-generated sequence numbers, for instance, which goes back to the old days when COBOL was being done on punch cards, because in COBOL a line can only be 80 characters wide unlike some other languages that give you more latitude.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

length the field.

- Okay. So do I have it correct that respect to COBOL programming you can really only use the seventh through the 72nd portion of the page in terms of if they are all columns? Right, right. And is it your understanding that all of the copy words appear or start in the exact same column? Oh, it's not true that they do everywhere throughout the program, but in these specific instances they do, again, in association with these other similarities. Were all PIC and column and comp and value statements -or were there other statements that were all aligned in the same columns? There were. The PIC statements were consistently aligned in column 39. And do we -- I think I have an example of that in my demonstrative unless we ditched that slide. We have the next slide which is the analytic dissection slide, the last one. Okay. We threw that one away then. So, yes, in all of the PIC statements, which in COBOL is how you describe what the data type going to be -- so you say PIC, and then you give it an indicator to say if it's,
  - All of the PIC words were aligned in column 39, and then all of the value words were aligned in column 51, and

for instance, numeric or alphabetic or alphanumeric in the

- then all of the comp -- one of the alignment issues that

  Dr. Astrachan pointed out -- were aligned in column 63 if I'm

  remembering the column numbers correctly.
- And assuming you remember the column numbers correctly,

  why is that of significant to you?
  - A Well, again, although I wouldn't dispute that a programmer might align things visually to make the program easier on the eye, there is no constraint in COBOL as to what column you would choose for that.

And so, again, the fact that both of these programs selected exactly the same column for their alignment is, again, something I would take into consideration when evaluating the similarity between these files, and, it's one more piece of that evidence that makes it clear to me that either one file -- that the rscmpay was either copied from psptarry, or that there is some common ancestor with psptarry with the Oracle file.

- Q Do you recall Professor Astrachan's testimony regarding the spacing irregularities seen in both the Oracle file and the Rimini file?
- A I believe so, yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 22 Q And do you agree with Professor Astrachan that the 23 spacing irregularities in both files is not indicative of 24 copying?
- 25 A In this particular instance, I do not.

MR. SMITH: And, Matt, can you pull up Professor 1 2 Astrachan's demonstrative on spacing, which I think is 3 DDX-538. Yes. BY MR. SMITH: 4 5 Now, do you recall that Professor Astrachan testified 6 with respect to this demonstrative that there are two spaces 7 between the word comp in both the Oracle file and the Rimini 8 file because of COBOL conventions to line up columns? 9 I had pointed out that this was an unusual, in my 10 opinion, difference with respect just looking at the spaces 11 themselves. 12 Generally, I think, programmers would have, for 13 instance, set up tabs or something to the extent they were 14 going to put things in fields. And then he came back and explained that, oh, well, 15 16 that's just so that comp could be lined up. 17 But then -- and this illustrates what I was talking 18 about before about the use of all of the PIC statements being 19 lined up, and all of the value statements being lined up, and 20 then the comp statements being lined up. 21 And, again, it's not so much that they're lined up, 2.2 but that they're lined up in exactly the same place that I 23 find telling here. 24 So are you saying that the double space after zero, which 25 appears in both the Rimini file and the Oracle file, is a

- function of the comp word aligning in both files at the same spot?
  - A Yes. It is not a requirement of the COBOL language that these things be lined up. It is not a requirement that they be lined up in a particular column.

But, again, with respect to these two programs, that double space has been added to allow it to line up in the same columns throughout the code. So where necessary to do that alignment to get it into the 63rd column, that's how it was done.

- Q Okay. And just for clarity, does the Oracle psptarry.cbl file, and the Rimini rspcmpay.cbl file have the same general alignment of 88 potential columns?
- A There's only 80 potential columns.
- 15 Q Eighty, 80 potential columns.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

A With respect to the data areas that are defined -- that's these things that start with 01, 02, and 03, for instance, yes, they do.

And they also do with respect to that example I talked about the other day, the 88 level that's used to provide a value in association with the data element.

- 22 Q That's why I was confused, 88 versus 80.
- 23 A Oh, yes. Eighty-eight is a particular reserve type of 24 COBOL value.
- 25 Q Okay. Let's go back to your demonstrative which

highlighted the substantial similarity between the Oracle file and the Rimini file, which was your side-by-side comparison.

MR. SMITH: It's the last demonstrative, I believe, and we can actually put this down. But let's just -- the 175 -- can we pull up 175 as a whole. There we go.

BY MR. SMITH:

2.2

Q Now, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, you indicated during your direct testimony that, as shown on the right-hand side of this first page, the program description provided by Rimini was important with the language that this augments TARRY. Can you remind us why you thought that was important.

A Because the PeopleSoft TARRY, or TARRY, this is a statement in the program written by the programmer who developed this program, that is stating specifically that this program was intended to augment functionality from the TARRY, and it goes on to list one other function that it performs as well.

But I thought it significant that the program itself self-identifies as being a program that augments that PeopleSoft TARRY program.

Q Is it your opinion that the rspcmpay file was copied or derived from, in some way, the psptarry file?

A I think as an initial point, from the visual aspect, the actual way the source code is arranged and laid out, it would be my conclusion that this program started, in all likelihood,

as a copy of psptarry, or some file that itself had been derived psptarry.

And then that with respect to the functional aspect of the software, because software really exists in two forms, it's its textural representation and then its functional characteristics.

With respect to the functional characteristics, it's an augmentation -- a modification or extension, if you will, of the function that's provided by the Oracle PeopleSoft TARRY program.

- Q Okay. Do you recall Professor Astrachan's testimony that it is important for programmers to follow convention?
- A I recall that testimony, yes. I think he said he would grade them down if they didn't.
- 15 Q And do you agree with that testimony?
- 16 A Not a hundred percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I think that, you know, there's kind of a fine line there. Adhering to convention to a certain extent is valuable to those who come behind you and need to maintain your code.

On the other hand, it can serve to stifle creativity with respect to, for instance, trying new approaches, or finding better ways to do something.

So, you know, it's not something I would say -- I don't place the value on it that Mr. Astrachan -- or Dr. Astrachan obviously does.

- Q Okay. Do you recall Professor Astrachan's testimony regarding the API, which was defense exhibit 500?
- A I think you're referring to the documentation for the Oracle API?
- 5 0 **Yes.**
- A For this -- yeah, for the SQL interface that's used in
  COBOL programs in Oracle to talk to the database.
- 8 O And is this Exhibit 500? I believe it is.
- 9 A **Yeah**.
- 10 Q And Professor Astrachan indicated that this is a document 11 instructing COBOL programmers how to program for PeopleSoft;
- 12 is that correct?
- 13 A Yeah. It's a PeopleSoft-oriented document, so it's how a
  14 programmer writing in COBOL in a PeopleSoft environment would
- 15 talk to this subprogram that's used in that environment to
- 16 talk to the database.
- 17 Q And do you recall Professor Astrachan identifying what he
- 18 considered to be conventional and constrained API naming
- 19 | conventions?
- 20 A Yes. I believe he referred initially to the names at the
- 21 | bottom of this page.
- 22 Q Okay. And what is the -- what does the bottom of this
- 23 page show?
- 24 A It's giving an example of the way in which one would call
- 25 an Oracle subroutine ptpsqlrt.

2.2

parameters could be.

So it gives an example of the parameters that that subroutine was expecting and their order. So you see that this -- when you call this program, you're calling it using action -- in this particular instance with the full list, "action, sqlrt, cursor, statement, bind-setup, bind-data, select-setup and select data."

So it gives some examples of what that parameter list would look like in terms of what the full set of

Q Okay. Just so I have this straight, would you expect a COBOL programmer operating in PeopleSoft to write into the code, capital CALL ptpsqlrt using statement with the word statement written out, s-t-a-t-e-m-e-n-t?

A Well, this is an example, so a programmer just -- these parameters have to be provided in COBOL according to their position within this list, but they don't have to have these specific names.

So I would not necessarily expect that a programmer would use statement spelled out in full. They might abbreviate it, they might append a prefix to it, but it would have to be -- it would have to occur in the list in this order.

So this is an example of where some things are constrained within interacting with this software, and other things are not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Okay. Does the Oracle file, the psptarry file, and the Rimini file use these purportedly conventional and constrained naming conventions consistently, in your opinion? Consistent with each other or consistent with this example or --Consistent with the examples that are provided in this document DTX-500. They both use some of the same words. They both use some different words. And for example in the case of statement, they both depart from this example, but they do so using identical words to identify the statement type. Okay. Can we direct your attention back to Exhibit 175, which is your comparison, and is there an example of this, I guess, shared inconsistency on page 20? Here would be an example -- it's probably a little Yeah. easier to see if we were looking at the fully expanded programs, one above the other. But you see on line 589 on the left-hand side, we've got that call ptpsqlrt using that would just looked at a minute ago. And, for instance, in the one that we were talking about just a minute ago, statement, you see that in line 592, both programs, instead of calling it statement spelled out fully, they call it sql-stmt.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So here again they are doing something that -they're conforming to the API, they have the list of parameters in the same order which is required, but then they depart from the example in what they're calling them, or what they're calling those parameters. Do you recall that Professor Astrachan spent a Okay. significant amount of time going over one page of your code comparison from this Exhibit 175? I think it's where he was drawing the red lines is what you're referring to? I'd like to -- yes, that's right. Yeah. And I'd like to go briefly over the other portions of the code that you believe are important for purposes of substantial similarity, and just ask you very quickly about them. So could you take a look at the bottom of page 5 to the top of page 6, and do you recall Professor Astrachan addressing this portion of your code comparison? I don't recall if he specifically addressed the flower boxes, but I think his focus was on this 01 data level S-YT -- or my focus had been on the 01 data level S-YTD, and

the name of these below that, the FETCH-YTD-SW, FETCH-YTD-END,

FETCH-YTD-START. I don't recall that he -
THE CLERK: I'm Sorry, Ma'am. You're going to have to slow down.

THE WITNESS: Okay. It's FETCH-YTD-END and 1 2 FETCH-YTD-START, and I don't recall that he addressed those 3 lines in his testimony. BY MR. SMITH: 4 5 And are those lines important to you for purposes of your 6 substantial similarity opinion? 7 Again, this is something that the programmer had 8 coded in the Oracle code. They had chosen those names. 9 I think he might have alluded to the fact that YTD 10 is a common abbreviation for year-to-date. But, of course, 11 you don't have to use it in COBOL. You're not limited on the 12 length of your variable name, so it could have been spelled 13 out, could have been abbreviated. 14 But here is a case where an Oracle programmer has 15 coded -- has chosen to code this particular programming switch and chose it within the S-YTD data structure and has chosen to 16 17 given it -- give it specific names for the values E and S. 18 So if that switch contains the value E, you could 19 say does this switch contain E if you were testing that value, 20 or you could say the name -- you could use the name that was 21 assigned FETCH-YTD-END. 2.2 And, similarly, if you wanted to see if it was at 23 the start of that process, you could test FETCH-YTD-START. 24 There's nothing that constrains the order that those 25 88 elements -- those 88 level elements need to be in the

2.2

FETCH-YTD-END or START, they just are assignments that are associated with that particular data value.

There's nothing that controls the use and choice of these particular names. This was something the programmer chose to do this way, and we see the exact same code in the Rimini file.

- Q Is there any significance, in your opinion, to the fact that line 139 in the Oracle file uses SQL-CURSOR, while line 140 in the Oracle file uses SQL-STMT?
- A Well, if you recall looking back to the list of parameters, you have to provide a cursor. It doesn't have to be called SQL-CURSOR.

I think in the API document we were looking at, it wasn't even consistent there. I think they give the example, on the first page of cursor, and few pages later of an SQL-CURSOR.

There's no example in that document of SQL-STMT for the statement. But, that's how it's being used in this context of this particular call to the subroutine is it's being provided as the statement variable.

Q Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to page 16 of 57 of this Exhibit 175.

Is it your opinion that the portions of the code at the top of the page are substantially similar?

A Again, those were -- again, it's a comment which is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

```
neither required for constrained other than that you have to indicate that a comment -- you indicate the presence of a comment in COBOL by an asterisk or slash in column 7, so that first position indicates it's a column.
```

But how many flower box -- how asterisks you put on the flower box, that's not constrained. What you put in the flower box, the actual description you're putting in there as your comment, in this case, additional library function parameter, is not constrained.

It could have been library function parameters, it could have said more function parameters -- library function parameters, or it could have been omitted entirely.

This is not functional code. It's just a programmer's eye catch is what we used to call them, so that when you're flipping through a listing, you can find something more quickly.

- Q Okay. Directing your attention to the bottom of page 18 and the top of page 19, is it your opinion that these portions of the code are substantially similar?
- A Can you -- you're saying the bottom of 18 and the top --
- 21 Q It's actually top of 18, my bad.
- 22 A Yeah. We're off the reservation here. Okay. Yeah, here
- 23 again, this is an example of a different kind of eye catch.
- 24 | This is in the part of the program that's actually doing the
- 25 | procedural logic of the program.

2.2

And so there's a couple of similarities here I'd like point out. The first is just that the programmer, in the case of Oracle, has chosen to put one of these flower boxes that starts above and finishes below the name of a section.

But the two lines that start with AA, those are actually functional code. Those are not a part of the comment. They are a functional code that is being bracketed on either side by this comment.

The names of those functions are at the discretion of the programmer. So AA000-MAIN is what the programmer chose to name this -- for initial part of the program that sets forth the MAIN logic.

The choice to have a paragraph within that section,

AA000, again, that -- the choice of that paragraph name is

completely at the discretion of the programmer.

Now, I'll point out that it's not uncommon for a programmer to use either alphabetic or numeric or a combination of alpha-numeric characters to help navigate the program.

So you often put things at the front of the program would be identified as 000 whatever, or AAA whatever, and the ones at the end of the program, you know, would be on the other end, 999 or ZZZ.

And this goes back to the old days when you were looking at programs on listings instead of on Glass so that,

2.2

you know, if I'm in the middle of the program and I'm on G, and I want to find something that's referred to as M, I know I go downstream, and if I'm on G, and I want to find something that's referred to as D, whatever, I know I go upstream in the listing.

But, again, that's a completely discretionary choice of whether I append it with, in this case, two alphabets and three numeric characters, or if I had used entirely alphabetic characters or entirely numeric characters, or a single A and a single number, all of that is discretionary choice for the programmer.

- Q Do you believe there's anything unusual about the fact that this main section starts with this AA000 on page 18, but then ends without reference to the AA000 in both the Oracle file and the Rimini file on the next page?
- A Yeah. What is unusual here, in my experience, is normally --
- Q Just for match reference, we're referencing lines 547 in the Oracle code and 233 in the Rimini code.
- A Yeah. And, Matt, is this any way you can get the AAA on the same screen with the MAIN-EXIT there? It would be a little easier to explain.
- No, we want the EXIT statement. We're going to talk about the EXIT statement here.
- MR. SMITH: Right above that. There you go.

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, where it says MAIN-EXIT.

2.2

So, again, the use of this MAIN-EXIT basically indicates that it's a way of better illuminating that you have reached the end of a section.

But typically programmers will give -- in my experience, at least -- typically programmers will give that exit the same name as the MAIN. So you would have, in this case, AA000-MAIN, and you would set forth MAIN'S exit as AA000-MAIN-EXIT.

Or if you had called -- you know, if your program was named -- or if your function -- if that section of the program was called something like that D000-FILE-RECOVERY, then you would have D000-FILE-RECOVERY-EXIT, so that it was always completely clear and evident what you were exiting from. You know, that this was the bracket, if you will, between the beginning and the end of an exit.

So I find it unusual that they have omitted the alphabetic prefix here on line 547 on the Oracle side, and in line 233 on the Rimini side, and instead they have both chosen to just call the exit to that function MAIN-EXIT.

Q Okay. I'd like to turn to your demonstrative which is your last slide, and it reflects page 29 of 57 of this Exhibit 175, and this is a page that Professor Astrachan spent a significant amount of time discussing and applying his methodology regarding analytic dissection to. Do you recall

1 that?

2.2

- A I do recall that, yes.
- And do you have some response to the analytic dissection that Professor Astrachan performed?
  - A Yeah. I think, you know, he went perhaps a bit heavy-handed on his red-lining tool here because he didn't really appear to consider whether all of what he was excluding on a particular line was subject to constraint or whether only part of it was.

So, for instance, he drew a red line through the first line here, the 888 on the Oracle side, that says initialize select data of S-YTD, saying of course you want to initialize your data.

But he ignored the fact that they were both initializing the same data, so that the initialize -- I have no problem saying that's good programming practice, you want to initialize your data before you use it in COBOL.

But it's the similarity of what's being initialized and what's being used in this particular call operation.

And, again, you know, when he got to line 890, he drew a red line there saying, well, ptpsqlrt is required, and it's not remarkable for a programmer to call the ACTION-FETCH or ACTION dash FETCH, as is the case here.

But, again, he's not acknowledging that that is not a completely constrained choice. That, really, as I had

2.2

testified the other day, as long as you present this list of parameters in the same order, you have a great deal of discretion about what you call them.

- Q What does the highlighting reflect on this page or in this demonstrative?
- A Well, SQL-CURSOR -- if we go back for a moment to that API document, or if you recall that API document, it was just cursor spelled out. It was a single word without any prefix in the API document.

So it says you need a cursor. You need a cursor. It's a part of the API, but what you call it is at your discretion.

And then the next line down at line 895, there is nothing in that API that addresses the set FETCH-YTD-END, setting that particular processing switch to true.

Because that's what's going on here. You're saying I'm going to put the value of true in that processing switch, and so that might be something that you would need to do in your logic but you would not need to call this switch this name.

Again, similarly, I think we've already talked about SQL-CURSOR.

The next area down is the ZZZ-SQL-ERROR, and while I agree with Dr. Astrachan that it's, you know, good practice when you've interacted with a subroutine to check and see if

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

you had any errors as a result, the use of the exact same name for the SQL-ERROR function is not constrained. That, again, is a programmer choice. What are you going to call the error routine that you're going to execute if you find an error in this particular part of the program. Do you consider all of the terms or language that you've highlighted on this demonstrative to be creative expression? They are -- they are creative, or at least partially creative. Like I said, you need a cursor to talk to this thing. What you call it is up in the air. You don't have to reference the word cursor in it at all, but it wouldn't strike me as unusual for a programmer to have cursor somewhere in the name. So on the one that's SQL-CURSOR, you know, that one is partially, partially suggested by programmer convention, but the others, I think, are completely independent of any -any constraint or convention actually. MR. SMITH: Okay. Your Honor, I probably have 15 minutes, I would guess, left. I'm happy to proceed, or we could break for lunch.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I assume that there will be some cross-examination as well, so let's go ahead and break for lunch, and we'll reconvene between 1:20 and 1:25.

(The noon recess was taken.)

```
RENO, NEVADA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2021, 1:25 P.M.
 1
 2
                                ---000---
 3
 4
                   THE COURT: Have a seat, please.
                   The record will show we are reconvened following
 5
 6
     our lunch break today, and we continue with the examination
 7
     and testimony from Mr. Lanchak --
 8
                   MR. SMITH: Ms. Frederiksen-Cross.
 9
                   THE COURT:
                               I'm sorry.
                   MR. SMITH: Before we do that, your Honor, can I
10
11
     just raise one housekeeping with you?
12
                   THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
13
                   MR. SMITH:
                               So I think I have maybe 15 minutes
14
     left with Ms. Frederiksen-Cross. We have a significant number
15
     of travel and other scheduling issues.
16
                   So with the Court's indulgence, and if possible,
17
     I'm not sure it's even going to be possible or necessary, but
18
     we would like to extend the day today past 5:00 so we can
19
     complete closings and complete this hearing.
20
                   THE COURT:
                               That's acceptable to me. I want to
21
     do the closings in one sitting, and I would offer to do it
2.2
     tomorrow morning or to do it this afternoon.
23
                   My preference would be to do it this afternoon
24
     and run it as late as we need to run it.
25
                   MR. SMITH: Okay.
```

```
1
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, we would have no
 2
     objection assuming that it can be fit in. We did not
 3
     anticipate such lengthy cross-examinations and rebuttal case
 4
     from Oracle, so I think we're fairly deep into the day, but if
 5
     there's time, then I'm happy to do that as well.
 6
                   THE COURT: Okay. Well, it sounds like we're on
 7
     essentially one page. I'd like to see it finish today, and
 8
     I'm sure -- I see a number of heads nodding so I can see what
 9
     the consensus is.
                   And, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, you may be one of
10
11
     the nodders, I just didn't notice, and please excuse me.
12
                   Mr. Smith, go ahead, please.
13
                   MR. SMITH:
                               Thank you, your Honor.
14
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION RESUMED
15
     BY MR. SMITH:
16
          Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, did any of the testimony that you
17
     heard from Mr. Benge or Professor Astrachan change your
18
     opinion that the files associated with the bundle update
19
     RS18F07, which included the SQR and DMS files associated with
20
     that update, are derivative works?
21
          No, nothing changed my opinion about that.
2.2
          Was the RS18F07 update delivered to Easter Seals before
23
     or after the injunction?
24
          It was delivered after.
25
          And are you -- how do you know that?
```

- A We see it from the e-mail -- I mean, with respect to the specific instance that we were looking at yesterday, it was delivered after as shown by the e-mail.
- 4 MR. SMITH: Okay. Matt, can we pull up Exhibit 5 90.
- 6 BY MR. SMITH:
- 7 Q Is Exhibit 90 the e-mail you're referring to?
- 8 A Yes, it is.
- 9 Q Other than this e-mail, are you aware of other evidence 10 that the rsi1099i and rsi1099m files, distributed as part of 11 this RS18F07 update, were further developed after November of
- 13 A **Yes.**

2018?

12

21

2.2

23

- 14 | O And what is that evidence?
- 15 A I've seen other copies of these files in the context of
  16 the Rimini II case that have later modification dates. This
  17 is a file that appears to be updated at least once yearly.
- Q Okay. And can you please remind us of your opinion as to why the SQR and DMS files associated with this update, as well as the RS18F07 update itself, are derivative works?
  - A Sure. As a first point, as we've discussed before, these files have no independent purpose outside the PeopleSoft environment. They exist as extensions and modifications to the PeopleSoft environment.
- 25 They rely for their operation on the framework and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- infrastructure provided by the PeopleSoft environment, and that would specifically be the PeopleTools, DMS Data Mover in the case of the DMS scripts, and the infrastructure provided by the PeopleSoft environment in the case of the SQR programs. Okay. We've heard some testimony in this case about #include statements. Is one of the bases for your derivative works opinions the #include statement? Specifically the #include statements that include and show that these programs rely on the Oracle infrastructure, and then the use of things that come from those #includes in the files. Professor Astrachan has testified that almost every program uses a #include statement. Do you agree with that? In some languages that would be true. Some languages use a different form for that kind of reusable code. And is it your opinion that every time there is a #include statement in a software program the result is a derivative work? No, not at all. And why is that? Well, I'm drawing the distinction in my analysis between those #includes that indicate a direct reliance on the

programmer is using some common reusable component that might

underlying Oracle PeopleSoft environment, for instance, as

opposed to a generic #include that just indicates that a

-1407

- be a part of a language set or of services for the operating
  system.
- Q Do the #include statements within the Oracle software
  files that you cite to as evidence of the file being a
  derivative work incorporate protected expression into that -into the compile code?
- 7 A Oh, they do when the code as a compiled, yes, absolutely.
  - Q Now, Professor Astrachan stressed the point that the RSI-1099 files, although containing the #include statements to incorporate the PeopleSoft source code, they don't actually do that until the source code is compiled or the software is run. Do you recall that?

Yes.

Α

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Does that have any impact on your opinion that the files themselves are derivative works?
  - A No, those files are created specifically for use in the context of the Oracle software, and, in fact, if you look at what's in those files, even before they include the code that's copied in from the #includes, they make reference to that code so you know that those #includes are being used.
  - Q Okay. Let's take a look at the exhibit we were just looking at, Oracle 90, and I'd like to direct your attention to page 4 of this exhibit. What is page 4 of Oracle Exhibit 90?
- 25 A That is one of the Data Mover scripts, the DMS files,

- 1 | that was included as a part of this update.
- 2 Q And can you remind us why Data Mover scripts are -- what
- 3 they are and why they're important.
- 4 A Sure. Data Mover scripts are used in the context of the
- 5 database, so they allow you, for instance, to move or
- 6 | modify -- move information into the database, to modify
- 7 information that's in the database, or to select and extract
- 8 | information from the database for use by the program.
- 9 Q Are the Data Mover tools part of PeopleTools?
- 10 A That is correct, yes.
- 11 Q Can DMS scripts operate or be run without use of
- 12 | PeopleSoft utility tools?
- 13 A No, they're designed specifically for interoperability
- 14 | with the PeopleSoft environment, and they rely on that
- 15 environment.
- 16 Q Do you recall Mr. Benge's testimony that the DMS scripts
- 17 | associated with the RS18F07 update were written on Rimini's
- 18 | systems without using Oracle's People's tools -- PeopleSoft
- 19 tools?
- 20 A I'm aware of that testimony, yes.
- 21 Q And do you have new reason to question that testimony?
- 22 A I do. There's really two principal reasons. One is that
- 23 | these files could, of course, not be tested or verified to be
- 24 | working accurately without having used a PeopleTools
- 25 environment, specifically a Data Mover environment, to test

them.

2.2

But the other one is -- if you could blow up this window -- or shrink this window just a bit so we can see a little bit more of the context, maybe half the page, or even the whole page is fine.

As you see here, this file refers to Oracle

PeopleSoft tables, for instance, the PS\_WTHD\_CNTL\_VNDR is the

name of a PeopleSoft table that was provided by Oracle as a

part of PeopleSoft environment.

And you can see here that what the script is doing is working with a lot of different variable names that have these very programmerly abbreviations, if you will, you know, we're a bit sparse with our vowels.

So what you see here is something that, for this to work, each of these names would have had to have been typed correctly, that is to say, they have to -- these names have to match what's in the database.

And so to say that this was written without some reference to the PeopleSoft tools or environment, I don't think that's a hundred percent credible.

I mean, I don't -- I'm not saying it couldn't have been typed in on a screen or on a text editor on someone's computer, but I think that it's really unlikely that they weren't either using a -- remotely using a PeopleSoft environment to look at the database to get these names, or

- possibly referencing, you know, some printout or some content that would give them that information, maybe a copy of another program that was available to them, but something to get these names right.
- 5 There's a lot of names there, even in a short 6 script, and, it won't run if they're wrong.
- 7 Q Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to Exhibit 604.
  - Do you recall that Exhibit 604 is the technical specification for the DMS scripts associated with the RS18F07 update?
- 11 A Yes, I see that.

2

3

4

8

9

- 12 Q And on the second page of this exhibit there's a
  13 statement at the top reading, "Development was completed in
  14 the OAKS environment." Do you see that?
- 15 A Yes. Oakland County, yes.
- Q Okay. So do you understand OAKS to refer to Oakland County, Michigan?
- 18 A Michigan or Maryland, I forget. It's an "M" state.
- 20 And you understand Oakland County to be another Rimini customer in addition to Easter Seals.
- 21 A That is correct, yes.
- 22 Q Is this document consistent with Mr. Benge's testimony
- 23 that the DMS scripts were developed on Rimini systems without
- 24 use of PeopleSoft utility tools?
- 25 A That does not appear to be true based on the wording of

the document here. 1 2 Does this document indicate that development occurred 3 in -- development occurred and was completed in the City of Oakland environment? 4 5 Yes, it says that the development was completed in the 6 O-A-K-S environment, which I understand to be the City of --7 or the County of Oakland. 8 Would Rimini have used Oracle's PeopleSoft utility tools 9 to test the RS18F07 update? That would be the only way it could be tested is to use 10 11 the DMS tools for this component of the update. 12 MR. SMITH: Okay. I have no further questions 13 at this time. Thank you. 14 THE COURT: All right. Cross-examination? 15 MR. VANDEVELDE: May I proceed, your Honor? 16 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead, please. 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. VANDEVELDE: 19 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, does JDE World only operate on the 20 AS-1400 operating system from IBM? 21 MR. SMITH: Objection, outside the scope. 2.2 THE WITNESS: My recollection is --23 THE COURT: Wait. Excuse me. We have an 24 objection. 25 Just a moment. I need to refresh on the

```
1
     question.
 2
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: And, your Honor, this goes to
 3
     her testimony about software being able to only run on other
 4
     software being independent.
                   THE COURT: All right. I'm sorry, I wasn't
 5
 6
     listening closely to the question. Would you repeat it,
 7
     please.
 8
                   MR. VANDEVELDE:
                                    Sure.
 9
     BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
10
          Does JDE World -- you're familiar with that software,
11
     right?
12
      Α
          Yes.
13
          Does it only operate on the IBM operating system AS-1400?
14
                   MR. SMITH: And the objection is it's outside
15
     the scope. We did not have any questioning regarding JDE in
     the rebuttal presentation of Ms. Cross --
16
17
     Ms. Frederiksen-Cross.
18
                   MS. VANDEVELDE: This does not go to JDE.
     goes to her testimony about her definition of derivative
19
20
     works.
21
                               I'll allow the question with that
                   THE COURT:
2.2
     understanding and expect it to be limited to that subject
23
     matter.
24
                   THE WITNESS: Counsel, I think you mean the
25
    AS-400, not 1400?
```

1 MR. VANDEVELDE: Yes, sorry, correct. 2 THE WITNESS: And that is the current platform 3 it runs on. My recollection is that originally it also ran 4 5 on, like, the S-36, S-35 platforms, but I'm not sure if those are still available from IBM. I think they've been retired. 6 7 BY MR. VANDEVELDE: 8 Okay. So it currently runs on the AS-400 from IBM. 9 I know that it currently runs on AS-400 for IBM, and I'm not aware, as I sit here, that it had been ported to other 10 11 platforms, but I think it had predecessor platforms. 12 So it can't run independently from AS-400, correct? 13 Again, I haven't checked super recently, but, as I sit 14 here, I think that's the one platform that it's deployed for. 15 So the answer is correct? 16 As best I know, as I sit here. Again, I would want to 17 research that to answer dispositively, but, as far as I know, 18 that's true. 19 So it can't operate independently of that operating 20 system, correct? 21 Now that the other operating -- or the other machines and 2.2 operating systems are not being sold, that's probably correct. 23 Okay. And it extends the functionality that didn't come 24 with that operating system, correct? 25 It doesn't extend the operating system functionality, it

- 1 provides an application functionality that runs in that
- 2 operating system.
- 3 Q That's new functionality, correct?
- 4 A That is new functionality that is not an extension of the
- 5 operating system but rather a program that runs using some of
- 6 | the facilities of the operating system.
- 7 Q Operating systems store data, correct, they have file
- 8 systems?
- 9 A Most do.
- 10 Q And JDE offers ways to store data, correct?
- 11 A In a database, yes.
- 12 Q And it does it in a way that extends the ability to store
- data in different ways, doesn't it?
- 14 A database management system is, itself, a specialized
- 15 type of program that allows for data to be stored, organized,
- 16 retrieved, and managed in a particular format.
- 17 Q Operating systems store, organize, and retrieve data in
- 18 particular format, don't they?
- 19 A Not typically in database formats.
- 20 | Q In file system format, correct?
- 21 A Some operating systems do.
- 22 Q Okay. Is JDE World a derivative work of AS-400?
- 23 A Again, as I have expressed before, I do not believe it to
- 24 be so, no, sir.
- 25 Q Were you -- on Issue Number 5 relating to rscmpay.cbl

- 1 | file and the psptarry file, were you provided an understanding
- 2 by Oracle's counsel of the difference between copying and
- 3 protectability?
- 4 A I think we have had that discussion, yes.
- 5 Q Was it in your report?
- 6 A I would want to check my report and see if I put that in
- 7 the legal guidance section --
- 8 Q What's your understanding of the difference between
- 9 copying and protectability?
- 10 A My understanding is that some things may be copied but
- 11 | are not necessarily a violation of the rights-holder's
- 12 exclusive copyright for various reasons, fair use, having been
- 13 | placed in the public domain, being de minimus with respect to
- 14 | the role in the new work, but that there are factors that need
- 15 to be evaluated before you say that something is necessarily
- 16 protectible expression.
- 17 Q Even assuming a line of asterisks or stars was copied,
- 18 | are you contending that that line is creative and protectible?
- 19 A Just a line of asterisks?
- 20 | O **Yes.**
- 21 A I think that is a common enough convention that, taken in
- 22 | isolation, that line is not a protectible expression.
- 23 Q Even assuming white space was copied, are you contending
- 24 | that that white space and alignment is creative and
- 25 **protectible?**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

- A Again, not in all contexts. I mean, I could see situations where it might be, but I wouldn't opine that as a general rule it is. I think that needs to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- Q Do you think it's creative protectible expression to choose the name "cursor" for the computer science term cursor?
- A Again, I suppose it was in this specific context, but I wouldn't assert that in all cases that were necessarily true.
  - Q So there's some cases where choosing cursor for the term -- the computer science term cursor is not creative or protectible.
- 12 A I would think that likely to be true, yes.
- Q Okay. How about for using the abbreviation s-t-m-t, statement, for the term statement, do you think that's creative and protectible?
  - A Again, it's contextually dependent, but in and of itself, absent other lines and other code, probably is a borderline case. I would want to look at a specific example to say yes or no here.
- 20 Q How about choosing the abbreviation YTD for year-to-date,
  21 do you think that's creative and protectible?
- A Again, it depends on the context and the code that's around it.
- 24 Q So you're saying that it is or it is not?
- 25 A I wouldn't think those three characters in isolation are

1 | necessarily protectible expression.

2.2

- Q Okay. But in this case you contend that the use of YTD in a line of rscmpay file is protectible expression?
- A No, I think that the line that contains it is, counsel.

And particularly, for instance, in the YTD that we've been talking about, it's not a single line in isolation. There's a series of four or five lines there that are identical, that perform specific function, that have unique characteristics, and that are not dictated by the specific programming conventions or constraints of the code in which they're being used, nor any other constraint that I could identify. And so --

- Q You said "partially creative" earlier in your testimony.
  What do you mean by "partially creative"?
- A Well, again, you know, you just asked about, for instance, the use of YTD to abbreviate year-to-date. Taken in and of itself, that part of the line I would not assume to be creative, just as a single word in a haiku I would not assume to be creative. But, when you string enough of those words together to get a fully formed haiku, you've probably crossed that line.
- Q Do you think that the term FETCH-DATA for a procedure that fetches data, is creative and expressive and protectible?
- A May be creative, not terribly creative, but may be creative because there are other ways that it could be -- you

- 1 | could say that same thing.
- 2 Q Is your basis --
- 3 A What were the other two parts of your question, though?
- 4 That was a three-part question.
- 5 Q Yeah -- no, I think it was one. Let me ask the
- 6 follow-up.
- 7 Is your basis for contending that, for example,
- 8 | FETCH-DATA is protectible, your contention that a programmer
- 9 | could use a different name?
- 10 A Certainly. I'm not saying that it's a masterpiece. I'm
- 11 | saying that, you know, it is something specifically coded by a
- 12 particular programmer in a particular situation and so has at
- 13 | least some small creative spark.
- 14 Q Let's move on to a different topic -- actually, hold on,
- 15 one follow-up question.
- 16 Is that your only basis to contend that that phrase,
- 17 | FETCH-DATA, is creative and protectible is that it can be
- 18 | written different ways?
- 19 A That's not my only basis in this specific situation, and
- 20 | that is because there is a copybook, that is an Oracle-written
- 21 copybook, that contains that expression and quite a few others
- 22 | that are used in the context with this rscmpay -- or, I'm
- 23 | sorry, within the pts SQL subroutine.
- 24 And so it's an Oracle-provided copybook that spells
- 25 out these user friendly names that can be used in the context

of interacting with that same program.

2.2

So if a programmer chooses to use that copybook, as we see in the cases here, they're using that name that Oracle created. But that name is actually part of a set of other names that define the various actions that that particular subroutine is responsive to.

Q Let me ask my question again.

Is the basis for your contention that the term

FETCH-DATA is protectible and creative only that the

programmer could choose a different name if he or she wanted?

A No. As I've just explained, counsel, that's one factor.

In this particular instance, I see that as one factor amongst several.

- Q What else makes it creative and protectible?
- A Well, again, it's a user friendly way of labeling what would otherwise be a single alphabetic character.

You could as easily pass the F character to that subroutine in a value that had whatever name you chose to, and it would allow you to perform the same function using that subroutine, because in COBOL the names of those elements don't matter, it's their position.

So here somebody has said, "I'm going to make this really easy to recognize what this statement is doing.

I'm going to do so by assigning certain names to certain functions," and FETCH -- the -- select FETCH, or FETCH action,

```
rather, ACTION-FETCH -- I'll get it right eventually -- was
one of the names that that programmer chose to help the
readability of that particular program.
          And that was an Oracle PeopleSoft programmer who had
originally created that statement, and so it's not --
     I believe my question was a yes or no answer. I'm just
asking a simple question.
          Is the only basis for your contention that the
phrase FETCH-DATA is protectible and expressive the fact that,
in your opinion, it can be written many different ways?
                          I'll object as asked and answered
              MR. SMITH:
twice.
              MS. VANDEVELDE: I'm asking for any other basis.
BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
     What's your basis for saying that's expressive and
creative and protectible?
     I just gave you my basis, counsel. Maybe I'm not
```

- understanding your question, but I thought I just answered that question.
- I don't believe so.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Is it that it can be written in different ways? What else beyond the fact that it can be written in different ways?
  - That there was a choice made to write it in a way that improves the readability of the program if you're using it.

- Q So beyond the choice --
- 2 A The choice to package it in that --

3 (Simultaneous indecipherable conversation.)

THE COURT: Wait a minute. One, you're

5 interrupting the witness while she's answering the question.

Two, let her finish her answer, and then if there's a follow-up question, I'll consider it.

BY MR. VANDEVELDE:

1

4

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q You mentioned choice. What beyond the choice of how to write that name makes it expressive and protectible?
- 11 A Again, I'm going to try to be clear here.

I think the choice to -- rather than passing a bare parameter, passing a parameter with a friendly name, the choice of the specific name assigned to that parameter, and then ultimately the way that that particular parameter was packaged into a COBOL copybook, along with other parameters related to the same program, is all a part of the creative choice of that programmer.

- Q I'm just talking about the name FETCH-DATA, the choice of the name FETCH-DATA. Beyond the choice of that term, what else, in your opinion if anything, makes it creative and protectible?
- A Well, it's not just pulling a name out of the air, it's pulling the name out of the air in specific context, counsel, in order to fulfill a specific purpose, and that is to improve

```
the readability of the program.
 1
 2
      0
          I'll move on.
 3
               Let's talk about local hosting. You understand the
     local hosting prohibition in the injunction to mean, as
 4
 5
     enjoined here, the hosting of a client's systems on Rimini's
 6
     systems, correct?
 7
          Which paragraph of the injunction are you referring to,
 8
     counsel?
 9
          It's paragraph 5.
10
          Okay. I don't see the word hosting appear in paragraph
11
     5.
         This is,
12
                  "...shall not reproduce, prepare derivative
13
          works from, or use PeopleSoft software or
14
          documentation on, with, or to any computer system
15
          other than a specific licensee's own computer
16
          system."
17
                   So this -- I don't see the word hosting in here.
18
     I'm not sure what you're asking me to direct my attention to.
19
          Have you never heard of the term local hosting in this
20
     case?
21
          Oh, sure, I have.
2.2
      Q
          Okay. I'm asking you about that term.
23
               You understand local hosting to mean, as enjoined
24
     here, the hosting of a client's systems on Rimini's systems,
25
     correct?
```

```
That is not entirely my understanding here. That would
 1
 2
     be certainly encompassed within what is in this paragraph, but
 3
     this paragraph seems to be a bit broader than that.
          So yes or no, you understand local hosting to mean, as
 4
     enjoined here, the hosting of a client's systems on Rimini's
 5
 6
     systems.
 7
          I would understand that to fall within what is
 8
     contemplated here, but I think that this is just slightly
 9
     broader than that.
10
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. If we could pull up her
11
     deposition transcript, page 3 -- not deposition, her trial
     testimony, page 365, lines 2 through 4. And, actually, if you
12
13
     could go up a few lines and get the question.
14
     BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
15
          All right. You were asked,
                  "Okay. You've defined an environment --
16
17
          actually, before I go there, I believe you were going
18
          to say --"
19
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Hold on one second. I need a
     few more lines, John, line 1.
20
21
     BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
2.2
          All right. You were asked:
23
                  "Okay. You've defined an environment --
24
          actually, strike that.
25
                   "Before I go there, I believe you were going
```

```
1
          to say you understood the term local hosting as --
 2
          tell us, what's your definition?
 3
                   "I understand local hosting to mean, as
          enjoined here, the hosting of a client's system on
 4
 5
          Rimini's systems, but that would be hosting it
 6
          locally to Rimini's systems."
 7
                   That was your testimony, correct?
 8
      Α
          That is correct.
 9
          Now, you testified this morning about allegedly finding
10
     4,481 documents, correct?
11
          That is correct, yes.
      Α
12
          And that testimony was under oath, right?
13
          That is correct. This -- I think I got the number right.
14
     I may have transposed a digit, but I believe that to be the
15
     correct number.
16
          You think you only transposed a digit?
17
          No, I don't think that I transposed a digit. I'm saying
18
     that if it was 4,481 or 18, I mean, I could possibly, in
     preparing the slides, counsel, have transposed a digit. But
19
20
     that is the number of files that I recollect.
21
          Did you double check your work?
2.2
          I actually had one of my colleagues provide that number
23
     to me over the phone.
24
          So you didn't.
25
          Not as we were preparing the slide, no, because that was
```

done after I came out here to --1 2 What was the basis for that number, 4,481? 3 It was the work I had done in my earlier report. 4 And it was the spreadsheet you cited in the report, 5 correct? 6 I believe that's -- I believe the spreadsheet was 7 provided with the report, yes. 8 MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. Can we pull up her 9 opening report, paragraph 198, please, and if we could focus 10 on that paragraph. 11 BY MR. VANDEVELDE: 12 Q It says, 13 "At my direction, three separate searches for 14 documents with Oracle copyright statements in 15 Rimini's production were run. The following keyword 16 search was used," and you set forth the keyword search. And you state, "The unfiltered search 17 18 identified 4,481 documents." 19 Correct? 20 Α Correct. 21 And that was your sworn testimony today, correct? 2.2 Α Correct. 23 And you cite a footnote -- well, you have a footnote 24 there, 203. Do you see that? 25 Α Correct.

- 1 Q And that's supposed to be the basis for that statement?
- 2 A Better be, yeah.
- 3 Q Did you check the spreadsheet that you cite in that
- 4 | footnote last night?
- 5 A I did not check it last night. At the time we were
- 6 | providing -- or preparing these slides a couple days ago I
- 7 called back to my colleague, Wilford, and asked him to provide
- 8 | the number to me.
- 9 Q And you relied on him?
- 10 A I did.
- 11 MR. VANDEVELDE: Can you zoom in on the footnote
- 12 **203**, please, John.
- 13 So 203 cites Exhibit 120, an Excel spreadsheet.
- 14 And if we could pull up OREX Exhibit 198 which
- 15 is that exhibit attached to your report, and if you could
- scroll down to the very bottom, John, the last row of data.
- 17 BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
- 18 Q Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, how many rows are on this
- 19 | spreadsheet?
- 20 A Could you go back to the top and let me see if it is
- 21 | filtered in any way.
- 22 Do you see any filtering?
- 23 A I do not here.
- 24 Q How many rows are in this spreadsheet?
- 25 A Go back to the bottom.

There are 1,070 rows in this spreadsheet. 1 2 So you're off by more than 3,300 rows, aren't you? 3 Could we go back to the snippet of my report again. Α Please answer my question. You were off by more than 4 5 3,300 rows, correct? 6 If this is the proper citation in that footnote, yes. Ιf 7 this footnote citation was for the other number, I --8 We'll get to the other number in a second. 9 Α Okay. 10 So you provided sworn testimony in a report that said 11 there was 4,481, and you supported it by a spreadsheet that 12 only has 1,070 rows, correct? 13 My recollection is that this spreadsheet was 14 de-duplicated, but I agree with you that this spreadsheet that 15 you're showing, if it's the full spreadsheet, has 1,070 rows. You didn't say it was de-duplicated in your report, did 16 17 you? 18 Pretty much everything we used in the report, with 19 exceptions where I noted otherwise, was de-duplicated. 20 You didn't note that, did you? 21 I'd have to go back and look at what I said about it in 2.2 the report, counsel. 23 And you presented an incorrect number to the Court, didn't you? 24

I am confident in the work of my assistant and in his

- 1 provision of that number to me.
- 2 Q Even though he's off by more than 3,300 rows?
- 3 A Again, I am confident in that number, counsel.
- 4 MR. VANDEVELDE: Can we pull up her report
- 5 again, John.
- 6 BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
- 7 Q The next two -- the next two sentences of your report 8 say,
- 9 "Next the results were filtered to only
  10 include text, .txt files, or files with file names
  11 that start with 00P. This search identified 1,139
  12 documents," and you cite to footnote 204.
- Do you see that?
- 14 A I see that.
- 15 MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. Can we look at footnote
- 16 **204**, please.
- 17 BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
- 18 Q Footnote 204 cites Exhibit 118, and it cites another
- 19 Excel spreadsheet.
- 20 A I see that.
- MR. VANDEVELDE: And if we could pull up OREX
- 22 | Exhibit 196, which is that Excel spreadsheet, Exhibit 118,
- 23 attached to your opening report.
- 24 **BY MR. VANDEVELDE:**
- 25 | Q Now, you told the Court this morning, and it's in your

- report, that the results of the filtered search revealed 1,139
- 2 documents, correct?

- A I believe that is the correct number, yes.
- 4 Q And that was sworn testimony, correct?
- 5 A Again, that is correct.
- 6 Q That was on your slide this morning?
- 7 A It was on my slide as well, yes.
- 8 MR. VANDEVELDE: And so, John, if we could look
- 9 down at the bottom of this spreadsheet.
- 10 **BY MR. VANDEVELDE:**
- 11 Q Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, how many rows are on this
- 12 | spreadsheet?
- 13 A There are 710 rows.
- 14 Q So you're off again, correct?
- 15 A Again, you know, I believe that this spreadsheet was
- 16 | probably de-duplicated. I would want to double check that
- with my colleague who assisted in its preparation.
- 18 But I have worked with Wilford for over ten years,
- 19 and he is someone who's -- the quality of his work I trust
- 20 **completely.**
- 21 Q But the number you presented to the Court is not
- 22 | supported by your spreadsheet, is it?
- 23 A The spreadsheet -- the number I presented to the Court is
- 24 | not shown by the rows -- the count of the rows in this
- 25 spreadsheet.

-1430

- Q It's off by more than 300. That's off by more than,
  what, almost 50 percent, correct?

  A What was the underlying number? 1100?
- 4 Q Seven ten is what you claimed --
- 5 A Right.
- 6 | 0 -- or what is --
- 7 A Right.
- 8 Q -- actually in here.
- 9 A I've got 710 here.
- 10 Q And the previous spreadsheet we saw that allegedly
- 11 | supported the 4,481, that does not support what you told the
- 12 | Court today, does it?
- 13 A Can we go back to the spreadsheet just for a moment to
- see if there is a count of the occurrences in these columns?
- 15 Q Sure. We can look at it. It's OREX Exhibit 198.
- 16 A Can you go up to the top, please, so I can see the row
- 17 headers? Okay.
- 18 Q There's no count column is there?
- 19 A I do not have a count column here.
- 20 Q Beyond these two spreadsheets that are -- do not support
- 21 | what you told the Court this morning, do you have any other
- 22 basis sitting here today to support those numbers?
- 23 A Here in the courtroom with me today?
- 24 Q Here in the courtroom today.
- 25 A No, not beyond my recollection of the process that we

- 1 used and the counts that we derived originally, I do not.
- 2 MR. VANDEVELDE: If we could pull up your
- 3 | surrebuttal report, paragraph 69, please.
- 4 BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
- 5 Q And you filtered another time based on file types,
- 6 | correct?
- 7 A That is also correct.
- 8 | Q And you -- that resulted in 934 attachments. Do you see
- 9 that?
- 10 A I see that, yes.
- 11 Q And you said that those are intended to be used with
- 12 Oracle database, correct?
- 13 A With respect to these specific ones that had Oracle
- 14 | copyrights, yes.
- 15 Q And, by the way, 934 doesn't match either of the two
- 16 incorrect spreadsheets we saw or the two spreadsheets we saw
- 17 | earlier, correct?
- 18 A That's correct because some of the zip files were opened
- 19 up, and we had expanded things before we counted the
- 20 individual files they contained.
- 21 Q And so your opinion is that 90 -- roughly, 98 percent of
- 22 | these 934 attachments, so that's 919, are intended to be used
- 23 | with Oracle database, correct?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q And you've previously testified in this case that the

- license that governs Oracle database does not contain a facilities restriction, correct?
- A Well, many of these were PeopleSoft Oracle licenses

  designed to be used in that PeopleSoft context. But I agree

  with you that I did not see a facilities restriction

  specifically in the Oracle database.
- 7 Q And you filtered based on file types that are associated 8 with Oracle database, correct?
- 9 A Well, I would note that these file types are associated
  10 with Oracle database but also with specific Oracle products,
  11 for instance, PeopleSoft uses SQL and NPKB.
- 12 Q Ninety-eight percent of 90 files that you say is left 13 over, that's 88.2, so that leave less than two files left 14 over, correct?
  - A I'm sorry, do that -- tell me what your math is again?
  - Q You stated at the beginning of this paragraph that there are 90 files left that are unaccounted for that you claim were uploaded by Rimini employees.
- 19 | A **Okay**.

16

17

- 20 Q And you say that 98 percent, roughly 98 percent, are the 21 file types intended to be used with instances of Oracle 22 database.
- So 98 percent -- you don't have to do the math -- of 90, is 88.2. So that's less than two files are left over,
- 25 | isn't that true?

```
No, I don't --
 1
 2
                   MR. SMITH: Objection, vague.
 3
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 That would be -- I mean, just
     doing the simple math transaction, 98 percent, 2 per 900, that
 4
 5
     would be -- hang on just a second.
 6
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: I'll move on.
 7
                   THE WITNESS: So I think -- yeah, I think your
 8
     math is wrong, counsel.
 9
     BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
          Let's talk about -- you testified that the evidence and
10
11
     testimony you heard from Mr. Craig MacKereth -- do you recall
12
     that?
13
          Which -- I was asked several questions about his
14
     testimony.
15
          Yeah, you heard his testimony, correct?
16
          Yes, I was here for his testimony.
17
          And you testified that the evidence you heard from
18
     Mr. MacKereth about quarantining was new to you?
19
          With respect to showing any -- any evidence of the
20
     specific quarantine method, or anything specific about it
21
     other than the generic statement that Mr. Astrachan had in his
2.2
     report, that he had been told there was quarantining.
23
          You're aware that one of the methods Rimini uses to
24
     detect files that should be quarantined is via e-mail sent to
25
     security@riministreet.com, correct?
```

A I'm aware of that, yes.

MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. If we could pull up

Oracle counsel's opening statement which is at transcript -starting on line 14 -- sorry, 34, line 14, to 35, the first

line. If you could blow up starting at 14.

BY MR. VANDEVELDE:

2.2

Q Mr. Pocker stated,

"After they receive Oracle code, even if it's from their clients, Rimini did not instruct those clients not to send Oracle code. As I've mentioned, there's no communications back to them saying, 'Oh, yeah, don't do this again; don't do it ever.'

"There's no evidence of notification being sent to what is called security@riministreet.com, and in their presentation and in some of the policies that are already in evidence, you'll see that employees who receive third-party software or copyrighted materials from clients are supposed to report that incident to Rimini at security@riministreet.com. There's no evidence that that was done in connection with any of these supposed accidental receipts of copyrighted material."

Do you see that?

A I saw that until the screen switched, yes.

```
1
          Do you think that's a correct statement?
 2
                   MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I'll object as outside
 3
     the scope.
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, she has testified
 4
     about how things were quarantined, and what Rimini did in
 5
 6
     response to alleged local hosting issues. This is directly --
 7
                   THE COURT: Well, it's also irrelevant.
 8
                   The Court is not concerned about a misstatement
 9
     that occurred by either counsel in the course of an opening
10
     statement.
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. I'll move on. I don't
11
12
     have to ask questions about that particular statement.
13
     BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
14
          Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, you reviewed e-mails relating to
15
     that e-mail address security@riministreet.com, correct?
16
                   MR. SMITH: Also outside the scope.
17
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, this is
18
     directly relevant to Oracle's contentions through
19
     Ms. Frederiksen-Cross about what Rimini did in response to the
20
     very files she testified about this morning.
21
                               The Court agrees. The question will
                   THE COURT:
2.2
    be allowed.
23
                   THE WITNESS: My recollection, as I sit here, is
24
     that what I reviewed was a spreadsheet or log of such e-mails,
25
     and I believe I may have seen a couple of examples of such
```

- 1 e-mails.
- 2 BY MR. VANDEVELDE:
- 3 Q Did counsel provide with you that log?
- 4 A Yes. I believe it was work product that they had put
- 5 | together with respect to just --
- 6 Q Did you review it?
- 7 A I did.
- 8 Q We talked last week about your process for making
- 9 summaries of certain SalesForce cases, correct?
- 10 A Creating the HTML display of what was given to us in the
- 11 | SalesForce table I assume is what you're talking about?
- 12 Remember we had the discussion about the GB column
- 13 | labeled Important? Do you remember that discussion?
- 14 A Yeah, I do.
- 15 Q And did you review the security@riministreet logs to
- 16 determine whether the materials attached to those SalesForce
- cases were reported to the compliance department?
- 18 A I'm trying to remember the format of that log
- 19 | specifically, counsel. As I sit here, I don't recall if that
- 20 was something I reviewed or not.
- 21 | Q So you don't --
- 22 A I think I searched for the specific attachment numbers,
- 23 but I don't think I read the entire log or anything.
- 24 Q So you didn't.
- 25 A No. My recollection is, as I sit here at least, that I

personally at least just searched for those attachment numbers, the attachment identifiers.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q Is it your testimony that none of the materials attached to any of those SalesForce summaries was reported to security@riministreet.com?
- A With respect to the ones I discussed here in court, are you limiting it to that or --
- 8 | Q I'm asking -- yeah, the ones you discussed in court.
  - A I saw no such evidence until yesterday in the courtroom when there was that discussion of the role of -- I'm sure I'm slaughtering her name, but I believe it was Maurya -- his or her name, actually -- that if you knew that that person was the IT person who enforced those actions, you might be able to infer that.
  - But I do not recall anything specific beyond that that has been provided to me that was -- we were never even given an explanation about how the alleged quarantining of these files occurred. It was just a statement in Mr. Astrachan's report that he had had a conversation and had been told that they had been.
  - Q You chose to present five SalesForce summaries to the Court, didn't you?
- 23 A I believe that number is correct, yes.
- 24 Q But you prepared six, didn't you?
- 25 A I think we actually prepared more than that when we were

- converting tables to HTML, considerably more than that. 1 2 But there's six on the exhibit list, correct? 3 I don't know what the exhibit list that was given to you 4 was, counsel. 5 Okay. You prepared more than five though, correct? 6 I know that in translating the SalesForce tables to HTML 7 there is a very, very, very lengthy exhibit that was prepared 8 that had all of the SalesForce that we were able to 9 reconstruct. 10 With respect to preparing exhibits for use here in 11 court, I know counsel and I talked about a number of them as, 12 you know, what would be a good exhibit. 13 I don't specifically recall if we talked about more 14 than five, or if we prepared exhibit drafts for more than 15 five. I just -- I don't know. 16 Okay. Well, you prepared two relating to Guest Services, 17 do you remember? 18 Α Yes. MR. SMITH: Your Honor, these questions are 19 20 getting further and further beyond the scope. This was all 21 addressed in her direct testimony. 2.2 MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, this is directly 23 relevant to how Rimini dealt with the very files that she is
- 25 THE COURT: Response from counsel?

accusing Rimini of locally hosting.

These individual SalesForce cases 1 MR. SMITH: 2 were discussed at length during Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's direct 3 There was an opportunity for counsel to testimony. cross-examine her on those cases and the cases that she 4 5 reviewed at that time. 6 Now we're in the rebuttal case. The only 7 content that I provided during the rebuttal case, or that 8 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross provided during the rebuttal case 9 regarding these SalesForce cases, was that four indicated that 10 there had been use by Rimini of the files to solve problems. 11 MR. VANDEVELDE: I'm looking at their slide, 12 your Honor. It has information about the SalesForce cases 13 that he presented this morning to this Court about the 14 local -- alleged local hosting issues. 15 I'm going to sustain the objection. THE COURT: 16 I will candidly tell you that I do not recall 17 testimony along that line in the rebuttal case. 18 BY MR. VANDEVELDE: 19 In your opinion, can a Rimini engineer install or create 20 a development environment for JDE without copying the open 21 code portion? 2.2 MR. SMITH: Beyond the scope. The rebuttal case 23 did not include any discussion of JDE violations. 24 THE COURT: Sustained. 25 MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, I'd like to make an

```
1
     offer of proof regarding a number -- actually, a few files,
 2
     and then I think I will be close to done. It relates to JDE.
 3
                   I take your Honor's sustaining of his objection
     that I'm not allowed to talk about JDE at all?
 4
                   THE COURT: Well, I don't recall any JDE
 5
 6
     testimony in the rebuttal case, and for that reason I am
 7
     granting the objection, I'm sustaining it.
 8
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: So can I just make an offer of
 9
     proof about a few particular documents?
10
                   THE COURT: You can certainly make your offer of
11
     proof.
12
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. I'll make an offer of
13
     proof.
14
                   Your Honor, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence
15
     103 -- and, your Honor, this is cross of Ms. Frederiksen-Cross
     in Oracle's rebuttal case. We would like to call her in our
16
17
     surrebuttal case. Can I do that, and go beyond the scope of
18
     their rebuttal case?
19
                   THE COURT: No, you can't.
20
                   MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. Then I will make an
21
     offer of proof on JDE.
2.2
                   Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 103, Oracle
23
     has come into this court arguing, without evidence or basis,
24
     in conflict with the documentary record, that the open-closed
25
     distinction is somehow made-up.
```

2.2

We would like to make a very brief offer of proof on a few documents, including the Gartner article that was excluded earlier today during the testimony of Stephen Lanchak, as well as certain e-mail communications at Rimini Street, that touch on this exact issue.

Were we permitted to introduce the Gartner article exhibit, it would show explicitly that the term open code and visible code goes back many years in the industry.

In fact, the article would say that -- says that,

"Third-Party application maintenance and support services refer to services that maintain, customize, modify, and provide technical support for the application within the MEANS provision by the software publisher such as tools or open code."

He goes on to say that, "While some ERP products are delivered with tools or APIs that allow the customer to modify portions of the product, for example, Oracle's PeopleSoft and PeopleCode, others such as JDE and SAP's ERP, have visible code that can be modified."

That article predates the injunction by many years.

We would also proffer e-mails, which are Bates numbered RSI2\_013352306 and RSI2\_013223831, and these e-mails

2.2

similarly show that Rimini was using the terms open and closed code and made that distinction as far as back as at least 2013.

Those very terms are used in the e-mails regarding JDE support, including closed code and open code layers exactly as Rimini has presented at the hearings.

These e-mails are in the specific context of providing support for JDE, and we believe that these are admissible for a number of reasons.

As I said at the outset, they are highly relevant. Oracle has come into court and argued that Rimini has effectively made up these terms, and these documents disprove that suggestion.

Second, they are self-authenticating under 902-6, and as business records.

Third, they would not be introduced for the truth of any matter asserted but merely to show that these terms were used in the industry going back many years, and used by the industry and by Rimini.

And, finally, the Court has discretion to let it in to prevent manifest injustice under Rule 16 despite not being in the prehearing order.

Again, it is only during the context of this proceeding that Oracle has made this argument that these are made up, and these are documents that Oracle has had in its

```
possession for many, many years, and in fact one of them, the
Gartner article, was produced by Oracle to Rimini.
```

And so we believe that they are highly relevant and admissible, and so we will plan to follow up with a very brief written submission on this proffer, but I at least wanted to make it on the record, and I appreciate the opportunity.

8 THE COURT: Okay. So noted. The Court's ruling 9 stands.

But if Rimini wishes to provide further supplement to the Court relevant to the issue, and feels that it is clearly within the scope of the rebuttal examination that's been conducted of Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, I will consider it.

## 15 **BY MR. VANDEVELDE:**

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

21

2.2

- Q I think I just have one more topic,
- 17 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, and it's relating to cross-use.

Are you -- are you aware that the Court has held
that Rimini is permitted to, quote, create the same update
file for multiple clients?

- A I believe I am aware of that opinion, yes. I don't remember the Court's exact wording in it.
- 23 Q It is, quote, "create the same update file."
- 24 A For multiple clients, yes.
- 25 Q Okay. And are you aware that the Court has held that

- 1 Rimini can memorize its work product?
- 2 A Yes, I recall that.
- 3 Q And the Court has held that Rimini can replicate the work
- 4 that it has done.
- 5 A So long as it does so without violating the injunction,
- 6 | that is my understanding, yes.
- 7 Q Do you understand that the Court has ruled that Rimini
- 8 may, quote, use the same tests to ensure functionality of an
- 9 update?
- 10 A I'm aware of that, yes.
- 11 Q And that Rimini is allowed to perform, quote, less
- 12 | testing if it so chooses?
- 13 A I believe the Court even contemplated that if they chose
- 14 to distribute something without testing, that was permitted.
- 15 MR. VANDEVELDE: Okay. If we could put up --
- 16 let's focus on issue number 3 when talking about cross-use,
- which is the Johnson Controls issues, and if we could put up
- DDX-202, which was a demonstrative.
- 19 **BY MR. VANDEVELDE:**
- 20 Now, using your understanding of what Oracle's counsel
- 21 gave you as to cross-use, how can Rimini address the W2 print
- 22 parameter problem for both COE, City of Eugene, and Johnson
- 23 | Controls without violating the injunction?
- 24 A Well, I haven't attempted to try to figure out what
- 25 | Rimini's work process should be, but, as a general principle,

```
1
     if Rimini went into Johnson Controls' PeopleSoft environment,
 2
     performed the analysis necessary to troubleshoot there, and
 3
     did their work entirely using Johnson Controls' license, and
 4
     developed a solution in that environment using only that
 5
     environment and not making reference to any other customer's
 6
     environment, as a general principle I wouldn't -- at least as
 7
     I sit here -- and, you know, I'm doing this from the hip as
 8
     I'm sitting in the witness stand, but --
 9
          Let me make it more concrete.
10
               Don Sheffield tested the print parameter solution,
11
     correct, at some point?
12
          At some point he did, yes, because he states -- I believe
13
     it was Don who stated in the e-mail that he said he had tested
14
     it in COE, City of Eugene.
15
          So he's in City of Eugene's environment, he tests the
16
     print parameter solution, which is just inputting B9999 in a
17
     certain parameter, right?
18
          I don't think you got the quite -- the right number of
19
     9s, but generally, yes, putting a -- you're basically
20
     supplying a definition for that parameter.
21
          So he knows the parameter, and he now wants to perform
2.2
     the same fix for Johnson Controls. How can he do that?
23
               He knows the specific solution, exactly what to do.
24
     How can he do that?
25
          Well, again, had he done that in Johnson Controls'
```

environment when Johnson Controls raised the issues, had he done that work there, I think there would have been no direct issue because he would not have been relying on another customer's environment.

And I don't know from the correspondence whether he looked up what Eugene already had, or if he did the old classic I'll try, I'll try this, I'll try this, ah-hah, here's what works in City of Eugene.

He just said he tested it. So he confirmed that that particular definition that he had provided in the e-mail was going to be adequate.

But had he done that work in Johnson Controls, I think there would be no specific problem.

O He already --

2.2

A And as I said earlier in my testimony, had he known that, had that been in his head before -- or at the time the problem arose, had he not had to rely on another client's environment, then I would have not thought that putting that number in was a problem because it would be something that he knew.

But in this case the e-mail chain clearly shows that that was not something that he knew. They fussed around with these other solutions and tried various things to fix the problem before they ever got there.

Q So let's say Don Sheffield figured out the solution for City of Eugene. He knows what to do with the print parameter

2.2

field and to type in B999 -- I'm shortening it, but let's just assume it's B999.

Can he then, knowing that specific knowledge, based on the use of City of Eugene's environment, go and do the same work for Johnson Controls?

A In your hypothetical, counsel, we're assuming that he did not go and figure that out in City of Eugene after Johnson Controls raised the issue, and he couldn't get at the Johnson environment.

In your hypothetical it was something he had solved last month or last year or some other point in time, and it was knowledge that was just in his possession that, for a particular field, oh, if this doesn't print right, go do this. Is that your hypothetical?

Q He knows the solution, having developed it in City of Eugene, and he wants to reuse that knowledge with Johnson Controls. Can he reuse that knowledge?

A I would think if it was just knowledge that he had in his head, it was just an experience he had had as a developer developing a solution, and he knows this particular solution will always work in this situation, it will work in this general type of situation, and so he's in Johnson Controls and he says, "Oh, I've seen this problem before, I know how to fix this," that he probably could.

Q Could he tell his coworker that the way to fix that

problem is to type B999 in City of Johnson's [sic] print parameter field?

2.2

- A Again, so long as he had not done the specific diagnostics and made reference to another client's licensed environment to diagnose, to troubleshoot that problem, or to develop the fix there, I think, yes.
  - Q So he can communicate B999 to his colleague.
  - A Again, if it's something that he just has as his general know-how because he solved this kind of problem before, and it's not work that was done in one customer's environment that is then being distributed to another customer, but rather is something that is just his general know-how as a person experienced with certain types of programming techniques, yeah, I'm assuming that he could.
  - Q And if the fix for that problem was to write one line of Rimini written code, could he write that Rimini written code, that one line, in City of Johnson's -- or Johnson Controls' environment?
  - MR. SMITH: I'm going to object as beyond the scope because now we're getting into hypotheticals that doesn't touch upon the rebuttal exam.
  - MR. VANDEVELDE: The rebut -- her examination was about Rimini-created files, for example, RSI1099M and -I and other ones, and so I'm asking about if Rimini writes its line of code, can it reuse it with another client.

1 THE COURT: I think it's within the scope. I'11 2 allow the question. 3 THE WITNESS: Well, again, in your hypothetical here -- let me just flesh out a couple details that will help 4 me answer it. 5 6 So you're saying that -- I'll use the two 7 parties here to make it easy -- they wrote a line of code in 8 City of Eugene, not in response to a problem raised by Johnson 9 Controls, but they just wrote a line of code because they were 10 changing the number -- the year from 2019 to 2020 on a form. So they had to go in and make that one change, 11 12 and they remembered that that was how they had done it. 13 they're not transferring any work product, they're not copying 14 any code, they're just -- he's remembering it and he's going 15 to go do it in another environment because he remembers that's how he did it. 16 17 Is that -- I mean, you're saying he wrote it, 18 and then he can use it over here, and I think much depends on 19 how it gets from here to there, honestly.

## 20 **BY MR. VANDEVELDE:**

21

2.2

23

24

- Q It depends on whether that one line of Rimini written is retyped or not? Or remembered?
- A Well, if it's transferred, for instance, from City
  of Eugene to Rimini and then to Johnson Controls, it's
  effectively being transferred from one client's environment to

another.

2.2

And I think there you have a clear instance that the work done in one client's environment is being used not solely for that client.

If, on the other hand, it's just some know-how the guy has, it's just something that, again, you know, he knows that you have to go into these two reports and change the year from 2018 to 2019 or 2019 to 2020 because he's done it every year since 2011, and he just knows that's how you do it, then I don't see anything that prevents him from doing that.

So let me understand that answer.

You're saying that it does make a difference whether he remembers that one line of code, or whether he writes down that one line of Rimini written code?

A Again, you know, that's a little bit of an incomplete hypothetical.

But generally speaking I think if you're talking about a single line of code, the thing I would want to look at is, you know, under what circumstances was the code written.

Was it being written over here because someone somewhere else had a problem, you know, a different client had a problem, well, that would fall afoul of the troubleshooting prohibitions.

But assuming that it had just been written at one point in time, and the guy just remembered that, yeah, you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
know, we do this every year, we've been doing this for a
decade, we go in and we change all the 2019s to 2020s, and
then in 2021, we change all the 2020s to 2021, you know,
something like that would just be a part of a programmer's
know-how, I don't think that that would be excluded.
          But as soon as you start saying he wrote it down,
then it's, like, okay, well, if he wrote it down, he wrote it
down because he didn't think he was going to remember it, he's
going to document something, and so it's a little bit more
sophisticated scenario and --
    And that's cross-use in your opinion?
     That's where I would want to look specifically at the
very detailed specifics of what was being done.
              MR. VANDEVELDE: Nothing further.
              THE COURT: All right. Redirect exam?
              MR. SMITH: One question.
                     REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. SMITH:
    Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, did Professor Astrachan, in his
report, use the same number of Oracle copyrighted files after
you filtered the number down, in his report as you used in
your report?
     Yes, and it's my understanding that he confirmed that
number when he discussed it with Mr. -- I believe it was
```

Butler, to find out how those files had been copied.

```
1
                   MR. SMITH: No further questions, your Honor.
 2
                   THE COURT: All right. Mr. McCracken?
 3
                   MR. McCRACKEN: Your Honor, if we may, we would
     like to call Professor Astrachan to the stand in surrebuttal
 4
 5
     for about ten minutes to deal with just the rscmpay file.
 6
                   THE COURT: Okay. Let's do that.
 7
                   And, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, you may step down.
 8
     Thank you.
 9
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Thank you.
10
                            OWEN ASTRACHAN,
      called as a surrebuttal witness on behalf of the Defendant,
11
                 previously sworn, testified as follows:
12
                   MR. McCRACKEN: May I proceed, your Honor?
13
                   THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead, please.
14
                   MR. McCRACKEN: Good afternoon, Professor
15
     Astrachan.
16
                   THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
17
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
     BY MR. McCRACKEN:
19
          I have called you back to the stand, Professor, to
20
     discuss the comparisons of the file rspcmpay.cbl and the
21
     Oracle file psptarry.cbl.
2.2
               Were you here for Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's rebuttal
23
     testimony about those two files?
24
      Α
          Yes, I was.
25
          And Ms. Frederiksen-Cross focused on what she thought was
```

- 1 | evidence of Rimini copying the Oracle file.
- 2 Do you agree with her that there is evidence that
- 3 | shows that Rimini copied the Oracle file?
- 4 A No, I do not.
- 5 Q For purposes of a substantial similarity analysis, is
- 6 | there a difference between the fact of copying and copying
- 7 protected expression?
- 8 A Yes. It's my understanding that as part of determining
- 9 whether there is substantial similarity, one has to determine
- 10 whether protected expression has been copied.
- 11 Q And with regard to that difference between the
- 12 | fact of copying something and the copying of protected
- expression, did you have any major disagreements with
- 14 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's rebuttal testimony today?
- 15 A Yes, I did.
- 16 Q And can you elaborate on that, Professor.
- 17 A There were several examples that she outlined as copying
- 18 | that I don't think qualifies the copying of protected
- 19 | expression.
- 20 | Q Professor, in your opinion, is white space protectible
- 21 expression?
- 22 A No, I don't think it is.
- 23 Q In your opinion is adjusting the white space in a file so
- 24 | that columns line up, for example, the pic statements line up
- or the comp statements line up, is that protectible creative

- 1 expression?
- 2 A No, it is not.
- 3 MR. McCRACKEN: Mr. Jay, could we please turn to
- 4 DTX-501, and look at page 5, and. If you could, could you
- 5 | blow up the top third or so of the page down to where it says
- 6 **A00-MAIN**.
- 7 BY MR. McCRACKEN:
- 8 Q Professor Astrachan, do you recall Ms. Frederiksen-Cross
- 9 testifying about this section of DTX-501 which is the Rimini
- 10 **file?**
- 11 | A **Yes, I do.**
- 12 Q And just to orient us, what do you recall she said was
- 13 | significant about this section of the file?
- 14 A As I recall, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross was discussing that
- 15 this says AA000-MAIN SECTION, as opposed to just MAIN SECTION,
- 16 and that that was notable.
- 17 Q Is the section of this file that's called AA000-MAIN
- 18 SECTION, is that the main section of the file?
- 19 A Yes, it is the main section of the file.
- 20 Q In your opinion is it protectible to name the main
- 21 section of a file MAIN?
- 22 A In my opinion it is not protectible to name this MAIN
- 23 | SECTION, as it is, and I'd like to note in reviewing hundreds
- 24 of PeopleSoft COBOL files, that all of them begin with
- 25 AA000-MAIN SECTION when they discuss the main section.

- 1 Q Is it protectible, in your opinion, to label the main 2 section with the letter abbreviation A000?
  - A No, it is not.

- 4 Q I think Ms. Frederiksen-Cross also testified that she
- 5 | thought this particular portion was significant because
- 6 | the flower box starting the MAIN section starts with an
- 7 asterisk, whereas the other flower boxes in the file start
- 8 | with a slash. Do you recall that?
- 9 | A **Yes, I do.**
- 10 Q Is it protectible expression, in your opinion, to start a
- 11 | flower box with an asterisk rather than a slash?
- 12 A No, in my opinion, that's not protectible expression.
- 13 | Q Why not?
- 14 A Because flower boxes and lines of asterisks in general I
- would not considerable protectible expression.
- And I also note that, as I mentioned, in the
- 17 | hundreds of COBOL files I reviewed, those that begin -- and
- 18 | these were PeopleSoft files -- that this is relatively
- 19 | standard among all of them.
- 20 | Q When you say, "this is relatively standard," what do you
- 21 mean?
- 22 A I mean the beginning of the flower box not starting with
- 23 a slash before the MAIN section.
- 24 Q So I guess just so I understand, are you saying that the
- 25 MAIN section often starts with an asterisk whereas other

- 1 | sections start with a slash?
- 2 A Yes, that's relatively common.
- 3 MR. McCRACKEN: Let's go to new exhibits. Let's go to Oracle Exhibit 175 and look at page 20.
- And while that's coming up, I will just say for
  the record that is Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's side-by-side
  comparison of the two files.
- And let's zoom in on line 592 of the Oracle

  9 file, if you could, Mr. Jay.
- 10 BY MR. McCRACKEN:
- 11 Q Professor, do you recall Ms. Frederiksen-Cross testifying
  12 about this piece of code that says SQL-STMT?
- 13 | A **Yes, I do.**
- 14 Q Okay. And how do you pronounce that, Professor?
- 15 A I pronounce it as sequel statement.
- 16 Q And I believe Ms. Frederiksen-Cross testified that this
- was significant to her because a programmer could have written
- 18 SQL dash the word statement all the way spelled out. Is that
- 19 | your recollection?
- 20 A Yes, that is my recollection.
- 21 Q What is your response to that opinion?
- 22 A I think that, as we actually heard Ms. Frederiksen-Cross
- 23 | say, programmers often have an aversion to vowels, and sequel
- 24 | statement is a very common abbreviation for the full use of
- 25 the word statement.

In fact that phrase sequel statement, as written, 1 2 SQL-STMT, is a standard in Sequel Light which is the most 3 commonly used database in the world. In your opinion, is it expressive or creative to write 4 5 SQL-STMT instead of SQL-STATEMENT? 6 It is not creative nor is it protected expression in my 7 opinion. 8 MR. McCRACKEN: Mr. Jay, let's go up one page to 9 page 19, please, and let's zoom in on the area that says 10 MAIN-EXIT, EXIT PROGRAM, so about two-thirds down the page. 11 BY MR. McCRACKEN: 12 Professor, do you recall Ms. Frederiksen-Cross opining 13 about this particular piece of code? 14 Yes, I do. 15 What was her opinion on rebuttal with regard to this 16 piece of code we're looking at, which is lines 547 and 548 of 17 the Oracle file? 18 That somehow this was an indication of copying. 19 Do you recall she said that this could have been written 20 as A000-MAIN-EXIT? Did I get that right? 21 There were -- I believe that's correct. And MAIN-EXIT, 2.2 as I determined from reviewing hundreds of COBOL files, is, 23 again, relatively standard across all of them. These are 24 PeopleSoft files that I'm describing here. 25 All right. In your opinion, Professor, is it protectible

- 1 and creative to use MAIN-EXIT instead of A000 MAIN-EXIT?
- 2 A No, it is not creative, nor is it protectible expression,
- 3 | in my opinion.
- 4 MR. McCRACKEN: Let's go to page 6, Mr. Jay, and
- 5 | let's blow up the top few lines, lines 135 to 140 of the
- 6 Oracle file. Thank you.
- 7 BY MR. McCRACKEN:
- 8 Q And, Professor, if you look at lines 136 and 137,
- 9 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross testified that there's a structure being
- 10 set up here for FETCH-YTD-END given the value of E, and
- 11 | FETCH-YTD-START given the value of S. Do you see that?
- 12 A **Yes**.
- 13 Q And do you recall her testimony about that?
- 14 | A **Yes, I do.**
- 15 Q In your opinion, Professor, is there anything about
- 16 giving the N variable the value E?
- 17 A No, nor is it creative or protected to give START the
- 18 | value S.
- 19 Q And if we go down a few lines to line 139, does that line
- 20 | relate to the cursor?
- 21 A Yes, and similarly to SQL-STMT being not creative nor
- 22 protectible, I think using SQL-CURSOR to represent cursor, is
- 23 neither creative nor protectible.
- 24 Q I think you taught us during your direct testimony what a
- 25 | cursor is in computer science. Can you just remind us.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Yes, I believe I made an analogy to a cursor blinking on the screen as giving the position on the screen at where you are, and that a cursor in a file or a database is the position in that file or database where you are as the program is executing and reading values from the file or database. So would it be normal, in your opinion, to refer to the cursor, which is a computer science term, as cursor? Α Yes, that seems very normal to me. MR. LIVERSIDGE: Mr. Jay, could we pull up Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's rebuttal slide 11. Is the -- oh, you've got it. Perfect. And just for the record, we're looking at rebuttal slide 11, which was a portion of Oracle Exhibit 175 showing lines in the Oracle file 888 through 909 or so. BY MR. McCRACKEN: And, Professor, we heard some testimony from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross about this line 888, the one that says INITIALIZE SELECT-DATA OF S-YTD. Do you recall that? Yes. Α And I believe Ms. Frederiksen-Cross testified that while she agrees one would initialize before doing other steps, she did not think the other words or elements on this line were required. Did I hear that right? I believe you heard that correctly.

Can you just speak to that, Professor, are the words on

- 1 | this line required?
- 2 A Yes, I believe I discussed that in my direct testimony
- 3 that the S in S-YTD is required because this is SELECT-DATA,
- 4 and that the INITIALIZE SELECT-DATA is required because that's
- 5 | what we are doing when we fetch data.
- 6 O And select data is a term we looked at in the API
- 7 document DTX-500.
- 8 A That's correct.
- 9 Q And, Professor, there's certain terms highlighted on the
- 10 | slide. What do you understand that to indicate?
- 11 A My understanding is that the terms highlighted in yellow
- 12 | might be terms that people would perhaps disagree should not
- 13 be constrained.
- 14 I indicated that they would be constrained and
- should be filtered out doing analytic dissection, and I
- 16 believe Ms. Frederiksen-Cross contends that perhaps those
- 17 | highlighted in yellow would not be constrained.
- 18 Q I think the term she used on rebuttal was that these were
- 19 partially creative. Is that what you heard?
- 20 A I did hear that phrase.
- 21 Q We talked about SQL-CURSOR. Do you think that is even
- 22 partially creative?
- 23 A I do not.
- 24 Q What about this line 895 that says SET FETCH-YTD-END OF
- 25 S-YTD TO TRUE," can you just tell us what that code does and

1 whether you think it is protectible.

2.2

A I do not think it's protectible. I also described that in my direct testimony as when you reach the end of the statement that you've just done, and this is when the return code is end, that you must set a value, and setting that value to true indicating the end seems relatively obvious and required.

And the fact that we are setting a value of the S-YTD, that's -- all those -- each part of this line is essentially constrained by the context in which it has occurred. It must be S-YTD because that's the section that we're in. It must be set to true because we're indicating the end.

So I don't think there's any creativity in that line.

- Q Right. And you're saying it indicates the end because, if we look at line 893, it says if the return code is end.
- 18 A Yes, that's correct.
- 19 Q Can you explain what that means.
  - A As we discussed in my direct testimony, once you've called ptpsqlrt, you wait for that call to end, and if the return code is end, you take a particular series of actions indicating that it's the end. And if the return code is error, you also have to take a specific sequence of actions.

And so essentially, in my opinion, this line is

- required by the fact that it's the end of the call that you made.
- 3 Q All right. Thank you.
  - And then at line 899 we see the highlighting again, it's just SQL-CURSOR once again, so we've already talked about that, right?
- 7 A Yes, we have.

5

- And then at lines 903 and line 909, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross highlighted something that says PERFORM ZZ000-SQL-ERROR.
- 10 Do you see that?
- 11 | A **Yes**, I do.
- 12 Q In your opinion, Professor, is it protectible and creative expression to call the error module SQL-ERROR?
- A No. As I indicated again in my direct testimony, we know at this point in the program that the return code is error because of what's on line 900 in psptarry, that it's an error.
- So we must perform the error routine, and we know that's named ZZ000-SQL-ERROR, so that's required.
- 20 All right. Professor, if you assumed that everything on 20 this slide that is highlighted by Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, and 21 which she claims is partially creative, if you assume that's 22 protectible expression, what's your opinion with regard to 23 whether this Rimini file is substantially similar to the
- 24 Oracle file?
- 25 A Making that assumption, which I don't agree with, but if

```
1
     we make the assumption that it is protectible expression, we
 2
     have a total of one, two, three, four, five lines. This
 3
     psptarry file is about 1900 lines of code. I would consider
     this de minimus.
 4
 5
                   MR. McCRACKEN: Thank you, Professor. I have no
 6
    more questions.
 7
                   THE COURT: Cross-examination -- actually, we
 8
     probably are due for an afternoon break. Is it short?
 9
                   MR. ISAACSON: Yes.
10
                   THE COURT: All right.
11
                   Go ahead, please, Mr. Issacson.
12
                   MR. ISAACSON: Professor, good afternoon.
13
                            CROSS-EXAMINATION
14
     BY MR. ISAACSON:
          You began your examination by saying you don't agree with
15
16
     Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that there's evidence of copying with
17
     respect to the rspcmpay file, correct?
18
          Yes, that's correct.
19
          And is it still the case that you -- that while you are
20
     able to ask Rimini, you still have not asked Rimini whether it
21
     copied that file. Is that still true?
2.2
      Α
          That's true.
23
                   MR. ISAACSON: All right. I have no further
24
     questions.
25
                   THE COURT: All right. Any further questions?
```

-1464<del>-</del>

```
1
                   MR. McCRACKEN: No, your Honor. We ask that he
 2
    be excused.
 3
                   THE COURT:
                               I'm sorry?
 4
                   MR. McCRACKEN: We'd ask that he be excused,
 5
     your Honor. No more questions.
 6
                   THE COURT:
                               Yes. Professor, you may be excused.
 7
                   We will take our break at this time. We will
 8
     reconvene between 3:05 and 3:10, please.
 9
                          (A recess was taken.)
10
                   THE COURT: Be seated, please.
11
                   All right. The record will show that we're
12
     reconvened following the midafternoon break, and,
13
     Mr. McCracken, I see you are ready to proceed so please go
14
     ahead.
15
                   MR. ISAACSON: It's Mr. Isaacson, your Honor,
16
    but --
17
                   THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.
18
                   MR. ISAACSON: -- he may be ready to proceed
19
     also.
20
                   THE COURT: You know, I apologize. I've mixed
21
     names several times, but I have to also say that this is the
2.2
     first trial I've had where I've had 12 different attorneys
23
     participating in the course of seven days, and I apologize for
24
     any of my mistakes in addressing any you.
25
                   MR. ISAACSON: You have no need to apologize,
```

```
1
     your Honor, we've been with you for awhile.
 2
                   Just as a housecleaning matter, we wanted to
 3
     admit Exhibits 1356 through 1362 which are transcripts of
     deposition designations that Oracle played in court, so it's
 4
 5
     just the written transcripts, and Rimini has no objection to
 6
     that.
 7
                   MR. McCRACKEN: We have no objection.
 8
                   THE COURT: All right, those are submitted.
 9
                           (Plaintiff's Exhibit 1356 through 1362
                           received in evidence.)
10
                   MR. ISAACSON: Without throwing things off
11
     track, we're very grateful that we're going to go a little
12
     late today and that you're allowing us to do that.
13
                   Before we do leave, we would appreciate your
14
     quidance as to how we go about having a discussion of a trial
15
     date in Rimini II.
16
                   THE COURT: All right.
17
                   MR. ISAACSON: And, other than that, I'm
18
     prepared to begin.
19
                   THE COURT: Okay. All right.
20
                   MR. ISAACSON: We have an hour for closing.
21
     goal is to -- if I accomplish it, I'll be doing it in about
2.2
     50 minutes and trying to reserve ten minutes for rebuttal.
23
                   THE COURT: All right. And I assume you have
24
     someone there to remind you of when you reach the 50-minute
25
     mark.
```

There's a lot of them back there. 1 MR. ISAACSON: 2 We'll see if they do. 3 THE COURT: No shortage of timekeepers here. 4 MR. ISAACSON: Right. 5 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, please, 6 Mr. Isaacson. 7 MR. ISAACSON: And, your Honor, I'm sure counsel 8 on both sides want to thank you for the serious attention you've given to what are serious issues in this case over the 9 10 last week. 11 From the perspective of Oracle, the time and 12 attention the Court has addressed to the issue Rimini's 13 contempt has been valuable because of what has been revealed 14 in the past week. Much like the jury trial in this case that 15 16 revealed the business practices that Rimini had previously 17 denied using, like cross-use, the hearing in this case about 18 ten contempt violations has revealed that the violations are 19 about broad and, in some cases, dramatic and even brazen 20 violations of the injunction that are built on the business 21 practices of Rimini. 2.2 This hearing has addressed ten violations of the 23 Court's injunction, and the Court will rule on those, but 24 those violations are the result of a business model that 25 continues to be based on violations of Oracle's copyrights.

2.2

Rimini does not believe in fair competition, as it says. As its history shows, it believes in competition based on copyright violations, and it continues to build its business that way, and now we know that Rimini competes also based on violations of a court order.

We have learned that Rimini's favorite word in this case is "isolated," and its least favorite words are "we are sorry."

Nothing was isolated here about the violations, and that is why they can't stand up and apologize for it.

They are defending business practices that they want to continue and that the Court therefore needs to address.

The violations were based on Rimini's ongoing business model which is now about violating a court order.

First, we have learned that since the injunction Rimini feels free to copy JDE code every day if it desires to develop and test updates in order to attract customers.

This was the foundation of the JDE portion of the jury trial that took place, and Rimini now says that trial was pointless because it was only about closed -- somehow says it was only about closed object code which Rimini doesn't even use, and it wasn't about open source code which Rimini does use.

Second, we have learned that development testing, troubleshooting in support of clients in the easy

2.2

environments like the City of Eugene that are not solely -- I repeat that words solely because that is the word used in the license and the injunction -- that are not solely for that client, that's accepted practice at Rimini.

Third, we have learned that informal delivery, another term, of updates to clients means that testing can take place in an easy environment and does not have to take place before delivery to another client.

There are more business practices that I will discuss, but these violations result from a company who, in the words of Rimini's senior executive, Mr. MacKereth who was here, was incredulous at the words of the Court's injunction about JDE, and he continues to feel free to interpret the injunction how Rimini pleases without seeking the guidance of the Court.

The violations arise because Rimini made virtually no changes in its business practices or business model after the injunction. It thought it was enough to have removed the general and PeopleSoft environments from the Rimini systems. In opening statement it even wanted to be complimented for doing that as if that was going to be sufficient to comply with the injunction.

Oracle believes it has shown over the last week that the evidence of contempt here is clear and convincing for the ten violations at issue, but the contemptuous conduct of

2.2

Rimini is just as evident from the business practices which continue to permit illegal conduct in violation of the order of the Court.

Matt, can we look at slide 2.

Here is our burden of proof and what needs to be proven. The Court has already set this out. Oracle has to show by clear and convincing evidence that Rimini violated the injunction, that's the ten instances, Rimini did not substantially comply with the junction, and Rimini's violations were not based on a good faith and reasonable interpretation of the injunction.

And those flow directly from not only the quantity of violations but the fact that these flow from ongoing business practices that they want to continue.

And after that the burden shifts to Rimini to show they took reasonable steps to comply with the injunction but were unable to do so, but what we have seen is they won't do it.

Now, the evidence was quite clear that Rimini made very few changes in response to the junction. From the top of the company in response to the injunction Rimini told everyone they did not have to change their current practices.

Seth Ravin, the CEO of Rimini Street, told everyone at Rimini Street that. He said, "We took immediate responsibility for the injunction only because of what we had

only -- what we had done years earlier."

2.2

Rimini said, "The injunction has no impact on our operations."

Rimini's general counsel told employees, "Pay attention to your managers about how to comply with the injunction," but then the managers did not do much.

Jim Benge, who was here, quarantined 17 files because they came from the era of the practices in Rimini I. He did that, he quarantined them for new customers but not for updates for old customers. He stopped two tools only out of what he said was an abundance of caution.

Ray Grigsby, in charge of the JDE team who was not here, told that JDE team, "We don't need to do anything."

Far from showing that Rimini took all reasonable steps to comply with the injunction or acted in good faith, Rimini now admits it did virtually nothing because it changed its practices, it said, four years before.

Further, in a -- it's in the injunction, Rimini represented to the Court that the injunction would severely impact its business practices, yet after the injunction issued, Rimini said it didn't have to do anything.

Jim Benge showed the contempt of this company for the injunction. He said Rimini is trying to do its best, but he then went through that, "All we did were the things we have already done."

2.2

Ray Grigsby, he's the one who adopted for all the employees the open and closed language that was discussed again today, open and closed code. That's what Rimini depends upon to violate the JDE portion of the injunction.

And he said in that note, in that message to the employee -- to the JDE team that Rimini would seek further guidance from the District Court as necessary at the appropriate time, and Rimini never did, and I'm going to talk more about that.

Rimini, in its opening statement and in witness testimony, has taken credit for what they say is compliance after the Court found their processes illegal.

The Court should not be impressed at any company changes that a business makes to its practices after the Court has ruled that it has committed copyright infringement. The Court may even remember telling Rimini that during the jury trial when they made the same arguments.

Rimini wants credit for the parts of the injunction it complied with, and it wants to use that as a defense for the parts of the injunction it is violating.

The attitude of Rimini towards this company was demonstrated in this hearing, the utter contempt for the order of the Court. It emanated from the top of the company, including its CEO, Seth Ravin, its president, Mr. Grady, and even the general counsel.

2.2

They told all of the employees of Rimini that the injunction was undefined, vague, and ambiguous. They asked themselves often, that's the word they use, "Why is this judge out to get us?"

They changed that. They changed that to telling customers that this Court was, quote, just sold a bill of goods and was misled by Oracle.

Rimini, including its general counsel and president, even said, "Now the circuit court will correct our course," which, of course, the Ninth Circuit did not do.

This is the company that counsel said in opening statement has always been respectful of this Court. Their conduct indicates otherwise, their internal words indicate otherwise, and even what they say to customers shows otherwise.

This should not be surprising. This case is come -- comes with a background and a history of its own that the Court is familiar with.

We had a trial before, and the Court summarized, in issuing the injunction, some of the things that happened there, and one of it is that this case from the beginning has been about Rimini denying its practices, and then, after trials like this, being forced to explain what is actually going on.

The Court wrote in its order on the permanent

2.2

injunction, in fact, it was on Rimini Street's assertions through various affidavits and deposition testimony submitted in summary judgment that the Court denied portions of Oracle's motion for summary judgment on its copyright infringement claims and let those issues go to trial.

However, at trial Defendant Ravin testified for the first time that Rimini Street did in fact engage in cross-use and other conduct which constitutes copyright infringement, but did so innocently and without knowledge that Rimini Street was acting properly.

And the Court also will recall that it gave instructions about spoliation of evidence because of a PeopleSoft library that was destroyed.

The Court has explained that the evidence from the prior proceedings show that the evidence establishes that Rimini Street's business model from 2006 up until at least the Court's summary judgment orders in February 2014 was built entirely on infringement of Oracle's copyrighted software.

Nothing has changed as the evidence from Mr. MacKereth showed. He said they could win JDE customers through his remarkable rewriting of the injunction. Again, the business model depends on copyright infringement, and, in this case, a violation of the injunction.

The nature of Rimini's defenses here also demonstrates its bad faith and lack of substantial compliance.

Rimini has built new business models based on the contention it can relitigate the jury trial that took place, and they can do that after the injunction.

Rimini never argued open versus closed code at that trial. Now they feel free to litigate it.

They stipulated to providing Oracle's -- to copying Oracle's original works, JDE and -- JDE at that trial -- well, no, to PeopleSoft at that trial, and they raised only a license defense with respect to JDE.

They stipulated to copying with respect to JDE.

Now they want to relitigate the issue of copying. Rimini says, and their witnesses said over and over again, that this Court says that the injunction only applies to illegal conduct and, therefore, they say, Rimini has the right to litigate over and over what is illegal conduct.

Rimini is wrong. The Court said the injunction applies to conduct that has already been found illegal.

Rimini has no right to refight that battle, but that's what they're doing when they argue open versus closed code, when they say we're not copying because of analytic dissection, and even their Spinnaker defenses.

Rimini conceded copying of original work at trial. The injunction was entered. Now Rimini says the Court has to analyze whether there was copying of an original work every time there's a violation the plain language of the

injunction.

2.2

We know Rimini is violating the injunction because Rimini's compliance arguments depend on a revised injunction which they never sought. They depend on a definition of open versus closed, and the injunction says only source code.

They say analytic dissection is required. The injunction says no copying. But they say every time -- if we just go in and copy to our heart's content before -- and do it on our systems, before you can find a violation of the injunction, we've got to get all the experts here and do analytic dissection day after day.

Rimini says it may develop and test updates for client A who needs it, and then -- but also for clients B, C, and D.

They are striking the word "solely" from the injunction in paragraph 2a where it says,

"Rimini Street shall not reproduce, prepare derivative works from, or distribute the different types of software documentation unless solely in connection with work for a specific customer."

And they are striking the words in paragraph 6, "for the benefit of any other licensee."

It also became clear through the testimony of Mr. Benge that Rimini relitigating the conduct that the Court

held on summary judgment in this case was illegal.

2.2

Rimini says it may develop Rimini code and work through PeopleSoft software in the environment of client A and then deliver it to clients B, C, and D, including prototypes for future clients.

The Court addressed that in its summary judgment order. It's -- and this was in the ruling on the City of Flint.

"It's undisputed the development environments associated with the City of Flint were not used solely for the City of Flint's internal data processing operations. Instead, the development environments were used to develop and test software updates for the City of Flint and other Rimini customers with similar software licenses."

Now they say, "We can use easy environments,

City of Eugene environments, to develop and test software

updates for the City of Eugene and other Rimini customers with

similar software licenses," and that was outside of the scope

of the license as the Court found.

The violations in this case are in no sense isolated and in no sense in good faith because they are connected to the ongoing promises -- practices of Rimini.

Rimini copies and modifies JDE open code with JDE tools to provide development and support. It uses

2.2

informal delivery, it uses easy access to environments not solely for the benefit of that client, and it copies Oracle code into technical specifications to use as pointers and markers.

Those are things that are violations where there's specific examples, but all things they say, "We are permitted to do and that we do."

It is not even possible to estimate how many individual violations there would be that would be included in just Rimini's copying of JDE code which Mr. MacKereth said is an ongoing and critical part of Rimini's business.

The substantial -- lack of substantial compliance and the bad faith here was also shown because the Acceptable User Policy is not complete.

You may remember when I asked Mr. Benge if he could reconcile the Acceptable User Policy and the injunction, and he said, "Well, that would take me about 15 minutes." It would take him much longer than that, because, if you compare, for example, just paragraph 6 of the injunction which is the paragraph that talks about support, troubleshooting, development, and testing for -- from one licensee to the other, and then you look at their simple instruction which is the appendix to the Acceptable User Policy, this is the one they said that it would use the easy to read, and do not do this, do not do that, there is nothing in there to tell the

employees what they are supposed to do about cross-use.

2.2

The bad faith here was also demonstrated by the fact that Rimini continues to use infringing files, and this was something we learned about during this hearing.

They issued a notice after the injunction saying, "We've quarantined 17 PeopleSoft files." Mr. Benge testified the files were quarantined because they were part of the early history of Rimini when Rimini had generic environments and PeopleSoft environments on its system.

He said that the quarantine only applied to new customers and not to providing updates to customers who already had the infringing files.

Well, that was false testimony because the document that we were discussing at the time discussing the quarantine file, which rsi960us -- 960us said expressly that that file was need by, quote, "All new clients switching from the Oracle update."

And even for old customers using these files for updates means that Rimini was continuing its cross-use as defined by paragraphs 4 and 6 of the injunction. It was continuing to work on those files.

The initial cross-use was not halted, it continued as Rimini continued to update the original files that violated Oracle's copyrights, a clear example of a lack of bad faith [sic].

2.2

Rimini's defense also heavily depended on Professor Astrachan, so a few words about him.

As I made the point again a few minutes ago, he did no independent investigation of whether Rimini violated the instruction -- the injunction. His only role, as a computer scientist, lots of people go to his classes, he writes textbooks, but all he would do here was critique Ms. Frederiksen-Cross.

For an academic, he had no curiosity. He said his expertise was the pedagogy of computer science, and his classes were popular, but there was no inquiry made in this case to help the Court determine whether there were violations of the injunction.

He was also -- it was more than that. He was also hired to just believe what Rimini told him and what he saw in their documentation.

His willingness to cross lines for his clients was shown early on because I asked him -- he initially said, "My understanding that a violation of the junction would be a legal determination, and that's not something I would do."

But then he said he had a -- based on

Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's work that for every one of the

violations that there's no violation.

And then he said, "No, it's just -- I was just thinking about cross-use," and then ultimately he agreed,

2.2

"Well, but I wasn't -- but the Court found that there was a violation with respect to Matheson," and he's not questioning that.

A lot of time was spent on Barbara -- with Barbara Frederiksen-Cross and just by Rimini witnesses about reusing knowledge.

Rimini spent a lot of time on this, but none of the violations here relate to the use of know-how. They relate to express violations of the language of the injunction, and all of her testimony was tied to specific violations of the injunction.

Now, I'm going to go out -- a little bit out of numerical order here with the violations. I would like to start with number 7 which is the copying of JDE source code because I think that shows a lot about what is going on at Rimini Street.

As background, Rimini's copying of JDE source code has already been found illegal by the jury. Here you will see the jury instructions, and you may recall these.

You set -- the Court set forth the elements of direct infringement the second of which was,

"Rimini Street copied original elements from, created derivative works from, or distributed the original work."

And then, as it was explained, "The parties

2.2

have also agreed as stated in your juror notebook, that Defendant Rimini Street copied the JD Edwards software applications and related documentation as well as the PeopleSoft documentation at issue in this action. This means that Oracle has also proven the second element of these copyrighted works."

The Court instructed the jury that Rimini Street copied, they copied original work, and that with respect -- and that Rimini did not defend the case on this, and did not say we're not copying protected work, we're not -- we're not -- we're only working with open code, none of those things, and Rimini was found liable for copying that code in that original work.

And then you'll see the jury instruction about defense at trial. The defense at trial on JDE was a license defense, were these being used for archival purposes.

And the Court may even remember that turned out to be just a way to avoid summary judgment because they decided not to present any evidence that they were using it for archival purposes because they weren't.

In any event, the jury rejected that defense, and the Court entered the resulting injunction. Rimini is brazenly violating that injunction because it is arguing it has the right to do what was found illegal at trial and then enjoined by the Court.

1 Rimini never argued this source code was 2 objectionable or to prevent them from providing JDE support. We've set out here a timeline of all the briefs to this Court, 3 and the Ninth Circuit; did not happen. 4 5 Rimini didn't even whisper it in those briefs, 6 nor did they say that the injunction should be limited to 7 closed code which isn't even source code, it's object code. 8 So as a result, you got the language of the 9 injunction. 10 "Rimini shall not copy JD Edwards software 11 source code to carry out development and testing of 12 software updates." 13 This is also what the Court held in its summary 14 judgment opinion about the JDE license for Giant Cement and 15 said, quote, 16 "The Court agrees that Article 2 of that 17 license does not permit Rimini to access the software 18 source code to carry out development and testing of software updates." 19 20 The result of the jury verdict on this issue was 21 a straightforward injunction based on the jury instructions 2.2 and the summary judgment decision.

23

24

25

they want to call open.

2.2

I have never seen an expert before say -- and this is Mr. Lanchak, that an injunction makes no sense if it's interpreted to mean what it says it means.

He said it cannot apply to open code, it has to be limited to closed code, but he agreed that source code is human-readable code, and that's the open code. And he agreed that closed code is not humanly readable and is object code.

Rimini's definition of source code is intended to thwart the junction, to relitigate the jury trial.

Rimini has never provided support for what is closed code, that's object code, they told you that. Rimini can't even access or copy closed code, they told you that.

At trial the only JDE code at issue was JDE code that Rimini did access and copy. We weren't litigating things that Rimini wasn't doing, we were litigating things that Rimini was doing.

Rimini's definition means that paragraph 8 of the injunction is meaningless because it prohibits what Rimini has never done and permits the -- and would permit the conduct held illegal at trial.

Mr. MacKereth said many at Rimini were confused about the injunction but he was not. He refused to accept the results of the trial or the plain language of the injunction that resulted.

2.2

Mr. Lanchak argued that JDE licensing, and he read the provisions for you, must be referring to closed code, an argument not made at trial. None of the language of the licenses actually accepts his limitations because the licenses say source code, not object code which would be the closed code.

Now, Rimini knew, as I said before, it needed court approval to limit the injunction to open code. It wrote that to the JDE team that it was adopt -- it was.

"...adopting this for the time being consistent with our current understanding, and we will continue to access open JDE code consistent with license terms and seek further guidance from the District Court as necessary at the appropriate time."

Rimini's decision to contemptuously violate this injunction is made clear in that exhibit, Exhibit 2. This is in November after a stay was lifted. This is different from what Rimini did when the injunction was first issued, then they made the decision to look at things over the shoulder. Seth Ravin testified to that.

You never heard who made the decision not to seek further guidance from this Court. No one accepted that responsibility, but we know that falls on the shoulders of CEO Seth Ravin who continues to build this company on business models that violate the law.

2.2

The decision to write this to your employees and to not follow through for a company when you have just been found to violate Oracle's copyrights, to have an injunction entered in to you, the decision to not transparently come to the Court and make the arguments that they want to make is absolutely remarkable. It shows the intent to disobey this injunction. It's one of the strongest pieces of evidence of a lack of good faith and failure of substantial compliance.

The plain language of the injunction, as I said, is evident in the definitions of the US Copyright Office,
Webster's Dictionary, Rimini's Acceptable User Policy,
Rimini's own expert, Professor Astrachan, and also the JDE dictionary.

You heard all this stuff about, well, industry -- there's industry use in this proffer about -- there's industry use of the terms of open and closed. That's lovely that there's this industry out there that use those words. Those are not the words of the injunction, and they don't mean source code. Source code means human-readable code.

And you heard about Rimini's over-the-shoulder processes, and you heard over and over again they don't like them now, but when the injunction was first adopted Seth Ravin said, "We implemented it."

Mr. MacKereth said, "Well, we thought about it,

we never did it."

2.2

The CEO said they implemented it, and then you heard the evidence that they told customers it was going to work out fine.

And there was even -- and then, Mr. Grady, the president of Rimini, said, "It's okay, the stories that the injunction mattered were sensationalistic, and most of our JDE work doesn't even touch source code."

Remarkably, Mr. MacKereth said the president of Rimini, higher up, did you not know what he was talking about and then made his own sensationalistic statements that Mr. Grady was criticizing.

The injunction has prohibited the copying of source code since November 2018, and now Mr. MacKereth predicts disaster if Rimini has to comply.

One of the arguments that was made was that

Oracle's definition of source code does not render paragraph

10 of the injunction superfluous.

If you look at them, only paragraph 8 prevents copying source code. Only paragraph 10 discusses cross-use, discusses derivative works, or prohibits copying and use of software documentation.

Then there was this whole litany of evidence, as

I just said, about industry practice in Spinnaker. There's no

evidence in the record of what JD Edwards' customers were

2.2

issued in Oracle's review of Spinnaker's processes. You heard that, you don't know what was happening back there, and it happened in 2011, and the injunction does not apply to Spinnaker, it applies to Rimini.

Mr. Lanchak argued that JDE customers have tools that modify and copy codes, but Rimini is not a client, they're not licensed, and the Court has already held in that summary judgment ruling I said, looking at the Giant Cement license, which is in this record as OREX\_67, that the license makes a distinction between what the client can do and what the support -- the third-party provider can do, and that's not access or copy code.

Mr. Lanchak has said, "Well, everybody I know in my history has been working with this open code."

He wasn't knowledgeable of any of the licenses and what was permitted, and, of course, clients can do those things, nor, in all of his history and all this time did he say he had ever worked with anyone who had been adjudicated as a copyright violator.

All right. Now, let me talk about violation 1.

It's -- the Court has already held that there's a violation here, and we summarize the range of evidence here in a chart on page -- that we've laid out here.

There's Oracle file and documentations on Rimini's systems, there's three of them for violations, three

more for lack of substantial compliance.

2.2

We know which clients sent it to them. We know that -- they say for each of them in these SalesForce things you get the Oracle copyright -- oh, all of them had the Oracle copyright warnings.

Some of them were internally distributed by Rimini, not just in the SalesForce record. Some of them were used by Rimini. None of them were e-mailed to Rimini security.

There was a contention that during the discovery period some gentleman who was not identified by what he did, did some quarantine in August, I believe, 2019, all right, but nothing contemporaneously.

There was no documentation of quarantine at the time, and all of these were admitted either directly or implicitly by Mr. Benge as violations of the Acceptable User Policy, and there was only one instance of discipline.

In addition, Barbara Frederiksen-Cross identified 934 PeopleSoft documents with copyright warnings, and then Rimini's expert, Professor Astrachan, looked at that and agreed.

There was some fuss today about what the files -- the files from which they were screened on to get to the 934, but the two experts agree on the 934, and then something remarkable happened.

2.2

Professor Astrachan discussed the 934 with the assistant general counsel of Rimini, James Butler, who reported that Rimini had already flagged these documents, they already knew about this, all right? As potentially containing third-party intellectual property material.

As was typical of Professor Astrachan, he asked no questions about this, and never -- Rimini never explained what it did with almost a thousand potential violations of the Acceptable Use Policy and the injunction that they knew about before our expert notified them about it.

Mr. Benge -- he's the only -- he and his colleague Ms. MacEachern were the only ones we know who have been disciplined, and that took years.

Rimini -- and then he testified about -- he was trying to testify they were acting in good faith, but it only showed what they're not doing.

We are, I think, still learning, and this is a situation where we've had a few occasional cases where things like this have happened, and we've got to make this more clear, right? Those boilerplate warnings aren't enough.

We're glad to have them.

But what you didn't see in the SalesForce records was when an e-mail -- when a file was sent that the reply was, "Please don't send this to us, you're not supposed to send this to us, this is not our policy." In fact, you saw

1 in some circumstances they were circulated and used. 2 We live in a world of boilerplate, and we know 3 it doesn't work by itself. And then there was a discussion of quarantine. 4 5 Jim Benge said, "If it was reported, it would be 6 quarantined." But we don't know what violations were 7 reported. 8 The files Professor Astrachan saw he said were 9 not quarantined. He saw no documentation of any quarantine. 10 Craig MacKereth got on the stand and pointed to 11 two SalesForce documents he said he thinks somebody went in 12 and created a quarantine. This is in August of 2019 while 13 discovery was going on, right after they agreed to produce 14 SalesForce records, but that's only two documents. 15 Let's go to violations 2 through 4. 16 Two through 4 -- I begin with 4 because it works 17 that way chronologically, Spherion-Smead, then Matheson 18 Trucking, and Johnson Controls. And there's a chart on slide 41 which summarizes 19 20 the cross-use of the City of Eugene. The files are listed 21 there, and -- for 4, which is Spherion-Smead, 2, Matheson, 3, 2.2 Johnson Controls. 23 The client environment that was used for testing 24 wasn't needed by that client. They dispute this, but we have 25 shown the evidence that says it was not needed by that client.

2.2

Was it solely for the City of Eugene? No one attempted to say it was solely for the City of Eugene. They said the opposite. They said, "We were using it for others."

We said, of course, who is the client requesting the update, there you see Spherion-Smead, Matheson, and Johnson Controls.

And then was there testing in that client environment. We know for Spherion-Smead there wasn't because they never got access. For the others there was no documentation.

The City -- moving to 43 here, the City of Eugene's software license prohibits the use of software for purposes other than solely the City of Eugene's internal dating processing operations.

That's the language on which the jury verdict and the jury instructions and the injunction was based.

Now, Mr. Astrachan in many cases was arguing against these prior rulings, and one of the things he said was if there -- is it -- I asked him the question is it cross-use if there's no reproduction or derivative work of Oracle's software.

And he said, no, it's not, "We want to see both of these," which is directly contrary to the Court's order in -- summary judgment order in Rimini II which talks about even if the individual updates was not a derivative work.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

However, we've also followed the Court's guidance as to what was a derivative work following the Microstar case. This Court has applied an analysis that Professor Astrachan has ignored and even disagreed with some of its elements. And we have followed those here, and this was where you get the testimony about using these things in the PeopleSoft environment and being able to use them in a PeopleSoft environment. The only dispute of fact here is the PeopleSoft tools fact, and you heard more testimony about that today. But all the other facts are present here that the Court relied on its summary judgment decision, and there is nothing in the facts of this case to distinguish it from Microstar. So the testimony, and Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, set forth, following what the Court said is the proper analysis, why that analysis applies here. This is an example of her testimony applying the relevant facts. So that brings us to the Spherion and Smead violation which is Exhibit -- there you go. Now, we know the City of Eugene did not need the form in 940 Schedule A update because it doesn't operate in the Virgin Islands. Everyone agreed to that. We learned that the IRS said that in November 2018. Rimini was not playing it straight when it

2.2

told the Court that US clients would generally need this update and that that's what its engineers were thinking in January 2019.

It has a Business Analysis team that they told you about that's in charge of reviewing these announcements and making decisions about who would be in scope for an update.

So when did the test in the City of Eugene take place? January 24th. This document shows that Don Sheffield, who, like his CEO and president, did not appear as a witness, tested the update in January 24th when only Spherion was in scope.

Why did he do that? Did he do it because the City of Eugene did it -- needed it? No, it was because Mr. Sheffield couldn't get into the Spherion and Smead system, he didn't have access, and so he accessed City of Eugene when only Spherion was in scope on January 24th.

The immediate prior entry before that by the head of the Business Analysis department on January 10th, Laurie Gardner, said only include Spherion within scope.

By January 10th Business Analysis had figured out what the IRS had notified in November, but what happened was they told you something different.

Mr. Benge -- there's a later e-mail where he says on January 25th I tested, referring to his test that he

2.2

said he did on January 24th. So they tried to move the test to January 25th, so did Professor Astrachan in that timeline -- in that slide I spent with him.

And the Rimini -- and this is an example of how the Rimini witnesses in this case were advocates. They overreached, they misstated documents.

Both Mr. Benge and Professor Astrachan told the Court what happened based on these documents but -- instead of investigating from their actual engineers what really happened, and they also testified about tests that were not documented.

So what happened? Mr. Benge and Rimini Street used informal delivery to violate the injunction.

What was remarkable and important about informal delivery was it was revealed not as an isolated incident but a business practice of Rimini on an ongoing basis.

He said, "I don't think it's a requirement necessarily that we test something in a client's QA environment prior to us delivering it."

But what they told you over and over again is,
"We're going to test it someday when it's a batch or," you
know, whatever. "But when a client needs it, we'll give it to
them, we'll give it to them as an informal delivery, and we'll
test it in an easy environment like City of Eugene first."

So that -- what happened then with Matheson

2.2

Trucking is they used the same update, and then they used that for a bug fix.

Mr. Benge tried to say, "Well, there was separate testing in the Matheson environment," but his testimony was entirely conflicting, both with the documents that said, "I'm not sure if it's been tested for Matheson."

And ultimately he said, "I don't believe it's been tested in the Dev environment." That's what he concluded.

Then after that you get -- and it's all in the same time period -- Johnson Controls.

And up in the upper left-hand corner here you heard some more about Johnson Controls today. That's a screenshot from the City of Eugene environment sent to solve a problem for Johnson Controls.

We learned that Rimini, in a phone conversation between two engineers, did a break fix in the City of Eugene environment for Johnson Controls.

Rimini says it was using know-how here, but that never held up. What happened was Johnson Controls identified a bug, Rimini Street went to the City of Eugene environment which had not reported any bug issue, they did troubleshooting of the bug, and then Rimini instructed Johnson Controls what to do.

Rimini Street -- City of Eugene did not need

2.2

that W2 bug fix update. The document said, "We will be handling this on a case-by-case basis. It will depend on the data they report," and City of Eugene never reported that data.

In fact, Mr. Benge tried to say, "Well, we thought they did, but then, after we took some time, we figured it out."

And he said that would take days but certainly more than an hour, and it turned out that notice came out less than an hour later. Once again, the Business Development department already knew that -- knew about this.

So I'm going to move to violation 5.

Now, this is a file that was just talked about, the rspcmpay file distributed at least 14 times to seven clients, and Professor Astrachan said it doesn't matter because of analytic dissection.

And, as I said, what was shown in cross-examination is analytic dissection is absolutely irrelevant for copying, and it's also been explained that -- how he started with A criteria, moved to 5 for the hearing.

And he's actually, with all his teaching and everything, never published in this area, but most fundamentally, 63, there is a Catch-22 going on here that he wants to use to nullify the jury verdict, nullify the injunction and even copyright law, because what he said was,

2.2

"I expect programmers to follow conventions, and the lines that are constrained by that convention I would filter out."

He expects only the conventional, and you don't count the conventional, and after that nothing is copyrightable and none of which is consistent with the language of the injunction.

If you accept that, they are free to copy to their heart's content, and contrary to that Professor

Astrachan admits programming is absolutely a creative process.

A few words about violation number 6, and -- if we can go to 69, the derivative work discussion that's been going on.

Professor Astrachan basically ridiculed the criteria used by the Ninth Circuit in *Microsoft* -- in *Microstar* saying that every game working on Microsoft operating system would be a derivative work. That's wrong, it would only affect the application software. It doesn't create a derivative work of the operating system.

By contrast, as he admits, there is a derivative work created by updates that alters the PeopleSoft environment. That's the next slide.

And for there he admits there's a derivative work, but he says it's not compliant with the -- it is compliant with the injunction which cannot be reconciled with paragraph 2 of the injunction which says you have to obey the

2.2

license, and the Easter Seals license does not permit -- does not permit that, does not permit the client to create derivative works.

Which brings to us to slide 74.

What happened here violated the junction. The chart you saw a little earlier on cross which says -- on rebuttal, that's not what happened. What happened here is that the update contained two SQR files and two Data Mover scripts.

Rimini e-mailed the update to at least Easter Seals, XCorp, Pikeville Medical Services, and others. These were derivative works, the SQR files.

So developing them in the Easter Seals environment violated Easter Seals' license, and that's paragraph 2 of the junction, storing and modifying them on Rimini systems violated paragraph 5 of the injunction, and reproducing them by e-mailing them to Rimini clients violated paragraph 5.

And the Data Mover scripts were developed and tested using PeopleSoft tools in the Oakland County environment and sent to other clients like Easter Seals.

The Court asked some questions about what was delivered and when, and we've answered that in the last section of that.

So I will say just one other word about the --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the tech spec documents which was violation 9, and what I will say there that what we learn there -- and this is where there were markers and pointers using Oracle code, what we learn is they copy Oracle code, they use it in order to be able to mark things to say put things there, and what we learned was it's not just this document. This is a practice again at Rimini Street. So -- and, lastly I'll say on paragraph number 10, that is also a -- an example of a business practice at Rimini Street because they are arguing that we can use derivative works created for one client and then also for future clients. They are not going to do things solely for that client, they're going to do it for future clients which is what happened with Johnson Controls and with Rockefeller --Rockefeller environment in that case. With that, I've got a few minutes left, somebody will tell me what that is, and I thank you for your attention, and I look forward to addressing you for those few more minutes later. THE COURT: All right, thank you. MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, may I proceed? THE COURT: You may, Mr. Vandevelde, go ahead. MR. VANDEVELDE: And thank you, your Honor. I

just want to echo Mr. Isaacson's comments as well. Rimini

2.2

appreciates the time and attention you've devoted to this matter. It is very important to us, and we very much appreciate your time.

This Court issued its OSC and set this hearing because it had questions about these ten issues and it wanted to hear evidence, the actual facts about these ten issues, so that's what we did. We brought five witnesses.

Your Honor had questions about PeopleSoft, so we brought the head of PeopleSoft, Mr. Jim Benge.

Your Honor had questions about testing and quality assurance, and so we brought the head of QA, Brenda Davenport.

And your Honor had questions about JDE, and so we brought the head of Global Support Delivery, Craig

MacKereth, and we brought technical experts Professor Owen

Astrachan and Stephen Lanchak, the only expert in this case who is an expert in JDE.

And so while Oracle instead spent the first -- I believe I counted 25 minutes of its opening -- or, sorry, its closing statement relitigating the past and talking about Seth Ravin, we want to focus on the evidence.

We intended to address your Honor's questions, and I submit that we have, about what was developed, where and by who, that it was developed for each client in each client's separate siloed systems, about Rimini's work product showing

that it is Rimini's creative expression, those are the files we have been talking about the last week and a half, RSI quarter tax, rsi940, RSI cmpay, Dev instruction, tech specs, those are Rimini's work product.

And what you didn't hear were opinions from

Oracle's expert saying that they were substantially similar to

Oracle code with the one exception of the rscmpay file.

And also presented evidence about how Rimini's

JDE processes work and how Rimini is simply doing what every

JDE consultant, system integrator, third-party support

provider, has done for decades, which is to modify the very

open code that has to be modified, that Oracle provides tools

to modify.

And so we'll end where we began. I'm going to go through the ten issues in a somewhat methodical manner, we're going to march right through them, and before I do that, though, I just want to briefly touch on the burden because I think it's important.

Oracle has a heavy burden in this case. It has acknowledged the elements that it needs to prove. They're up here on this slide, this is from Oracle's brief.

It has to prove that Rimini violated the Court's injunction, that it was beyond substantial compliance, that Rimini's violations were not based on a good faith and reasonable interpretation of the injunction, and all of these

2.2

have to be proven by clear and convincing evidence, and that's a heavy burden.

The Supreme Court has said that the fact finder has to have an abiding conviction of the truth its factual contentions are highly probable, that there's no substantial doubt, the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind, and at the bottom one there, the absence of evidence, the absence evidence does not support a conclusion that a plaintiff has met their burden by clear and convincing evidence.

Now, why is that last point so important in this case? Because this is what this slide, 806, demonstrates

Oracle's strategy here. These are examples of Oracle's improper attempt to burden shift, to shift the burden onto Rimini.

The slide on the -- the portion on the left says

Rimini has no evidence that they complied with the junction.

That's from Oracle's opening. That's burden shifting.

Throughout the trial there's numerous instances where Oracle was saying there's no evidence of discipline.

That was false, by the way. There's no evidence that it was quarantined. That was false by the way. But these are examples of burden shifting.

They said, "I saw no evidence that Rimini was complying with this policy." Again, that was false, but it's also burden shifting.

2.2

That there was no evidence that it was reported or that it was tested or that it was developed. All of those are burden-shifting tactics to put the onus on Rimini to prove it is not in contempt when the only burden here is on Oracle.

In fact, you heard Mr. Isaacson talk about who Rimini could have called and didn't call, and who they should have put on. Again, those are forms of burden shifting, and it is not proper in this proceeding where the only burden is on Oracle.

Now, I want to get through the -- start the ten issues. Here they are again, and I'll talk about the first set of them. Those are the two PeopleSoft local hosting issues.

Now, as your Honor has ruled, the local hosting conduct at issue in Rimini I was the hosting of entire environments, and Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, as you see in this second box here, she interpreted that prohibition as enjoining hosting of a client's systems.

That's Oracle's own expert interpreting consistently with what your Honor had ruled, that it was about environments, and that what is not at issue here because there are no environments on Rimini's systems.

Your Honor many years ago ordered that Rimini couldn't locally host environments, and so Rimini got all of those environments off its systems and moved them back to its

2.2

clients, and, ever since, has been having a remote model where each client's environment is on their own separate and siloed systems, and it is undisputed that Rimini does not host those any more.

So what was at issue in this hearing?

Well, the evidence, the actual evidence was

Well, the evidence, the actual evidence was about four support cases involving eight files and three e-mails involving 11 files, and that's in the context, as you heard evidence of, and it wasn't disputed, 10 to 15,000 updates during the relevant time period.

Ms. Frederiksen-Cross admitted that each of these files you see here was sent to Rimini by a client or even an Oracle partner in one case.

And what they came to this hearing saying turned out not to be true. When we started this hearing Oracle's message was there was no warnings to clients. Oracle's counsel said they haven't identified a single reminder. That wasn't true.

Ms. Frederiksen-Cross says, "I've never seen such evidence." We all now remember the GB column labeled Important that showed warning after warning after warning.

They told your Honor that there was no quarantining of files. That was actually not true.

Mr. MacKereth talked about that.

They said that there was no reports to

2.2

compliance. That was not true. That there was no outreach to clients that sent files. Again, that was not true.

What the actual evidence showed in this case was that there were warnings to clients. There is automatic scanning and quarantining. There is routine training for employees and education of its own clients, and that employees have been disciplined, and there is outreach to clients who have sent files.

And so Oracle pivoted, and so you heard that this morning. They pivoted to a whole new set of files that was not part of your Honor's OSC. They put before your Honor a number, 4,481, which had no basis, was not supported by any evidence in Ms. Frederiksen-Cross's report.

They put forth another number, 1,070, that was also not supported by any evidence we've seen, and she, herself, admitted that those spreadsheets did not support her analysis.

And so where they landed was on this number 934.

But what's important here is that they offered

no opinions on the content of those files, and the testimony
is right below.

I asked Ms. Frederiksen-Cross,

"And of those 934 documents, you didn't offer opinions on the contents of those files, correct?"

And she said only with respect to the few that

2.2

she had presented the day before, not to the balance of those files.

Nor did they offer an opinion on how they were used. And, in fact, she, herself, wrote that the files are intended to be used with Oracle database. I asked her that, and she said that's correct.

And, importantly, there's no facilities restriction as to Oracle's database. There's no local hosting prohibition, there's no facilities restriction.

The Ninth Circuit has said there can only be a local hosting prohibition if there is a facilities restriction in the license, and Oracle database is governed by the OLSA and not any other license with a facilities restriction.

I'll turn now to Issue 5. There's obviously been a lot of testimony about this. This slide is from Professor Astrachan. He analyzed these files, he did analytic dissection in the first instance before Ms. Frederiksen-Cross had done any of that. The first time she had done analytic dissection was in this hearing this week.

Professor Astrachan analyzed the files and pointed out that although they load data from the same database, they act differently, they have different purposes, different functions. They load different types of data.

Rimini's loads less data but more granular data.

It breaks it into more detail. It stores it in different

Rimini-created data structures.

2.2

And then we saw the analytic dissection based on these code comparisons, but what's important to remember, these side-by-side comparisons that Ms. Frederiksen-Cross prepared, these are the very same side-by-side comparisons generated by a tool she used in another case that were deemed unreliable in a copyright case.

These exact same tools generating the exact same type of side-by-side comparisons were deemed unreliable, and her opinions were excluded.

Now, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross had never before performed analytic dissection on this file before this week. She did not consider any constraints that are set forth by the Ninth Circuit or by Nimmer on Copyright like APIs, like industry terms, like required terms under the programming language itself.

She attempted to say that naming a procedure error processing because the procedure actually processes errors was somehow protectible and creative.

She said you could use the phrase go get 'em instead of FETCH-DATA. Her opinion seems to be that if you can name a variable anything you want, that that makes it unconstrained, in her words, and therefore inherently protectible. That's not the law.

She focused on stars or asterisks and spaces and

2.2

slashes. Those were the basis for her opinions, and she's conflating copying with protectability. That's the key question here, are these things protectible, and she didn't filter them out.

Professor Astrachan, on the other hand, he methodically went through this file, he analyzed each line, he talked about those terms, and he filtered out, this is not protectible expression.

It's not copied. He didn't see indications of copying either, but even if it were, that doesn't mean it was protectible. That's the key.

And it's not just that she hadn't done the analysis before, which she didn't, or that she did it wrong, which she did, it's that the analysis that she did do was misleading, and she even walked some of it back today.

The side-by-side comparisons, as I mentioned, those were found to generate false positives. That's in the Drop Zone case where the Court excluded her analysis.

She claimed that 30 percent of the lines matched through what she called normalized line matching, but then admitted that that was before any filtering had been applied to take into account any constraints, and that only some of them were interesting.

And she acknowledged that when do you normalized line matching, which she essentially backed off of in terms it

2.2

being -- relying on it in this proceeding, she acknowledged that it destroys all structure, sequence, and organization.

You can't take a normalized line match in those two sets of lines and compare them and reach a reliable result because they completely eliminate all structure, sequence, and organization.

And then in this third bullet we see -- she made a big deal, she spent a lot of time on the so-called orphan asterisks and the oddness with the flower box, and then this morning, recognizing the weakness of that position, she backed off of it. She retracted that opinion.

And we actually saw this, the reason she backed off that opinion is because she based it using different types of fonts in the files to create, to manufacture a fake difference.

Where that star under the red arrow in this slide somehow juts out way beyond where it should have been, that was a manufactured difference, and it was the basis of her testimony until this morning when she retracted that opinion.

Now, I want to turn to the cross-use issues.

There's five of them, issues 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10, and there are a couple of issues that underlie all of the cross-use issues that I want to briefly hit here.

First, this is the law, this is the Ninth

Circuit law, the definition of derivative work.

2.2

It has to -- it must substantially incorporate protected material from the pre-existing work in some form, literal or nonliteral, but it has to substantially incorporate protected material. That's the definition.

And what's critical here is there has been a lot of confusion that Rimini -- we have been trying to unpack because when Ms. Frederiksen-Cross talks about files and code, she's not making clear where that code is.

So, yes, when Rimini uses its own expression, these blue files, that she said she had no opinion on whether they were substantially similar to any Oracle code, it's undisputed that those are Rimini-written expression.

When the Rimini expression is in the client environment, and, yes, it modifies that client environment, yes, that is a derivative work, but it's compliant. Why?

Because the client has a license.

There's no dispute that every single client with respect to every environment and with respect to every file has a license. So when that Rimini expression is in the client's environment, that's licensed, it's not a violation of the injunction.

But that doesn't somehow transform the Rimini expression by itself into a derivative work unless it substantially incorporates Oracle expression which it's

undisputed that it doesn't.

2.2

Now, Oracle, they put forth a series of definitions all of which are wrong. Every single definition on this slide is wrong.

They said that a derivative work is something tailored only to work with copyrighted software. That's not the law.

They said it's something that modifies or extends copyrighted software. That is not the law.

That it cannot operate independently of other copyrighted software. That is not the law.

This morning I asked Ms. Frederiksen-Cross about JDE World, and she acknowledged that JDE World can only run on a particular version of IBM operating system called AS400. If that were the definition, independent -- cannot operate independently of, it would make a derivative work of JDE World of that operating system.

And so what happened -- and you've seen this the last two days, Oracle has pivoted to this what I'll call the #include theory of derivative work.

And, again, Oracle obfuscated where things were happening to make it seem like all this copying and merging and compiling and running of code was just everywhere. That's not the case.

All of that copying of Oracle code with respect

2.2

to #include, that is only in the client's environment. It's only when the code is compiled, it's only when the code is run.

On Rimini's systems, when it says #include and it has a file name, that's just a reference to an Oracle file so that when later it is incorporated into the client environment and it is run and compiled, then, yes, there is copying that happens that is licensed.

But when that Rimini-written file sitting on Rimini's server by itself has a #include, that does not make it a derivative work, that is not substantial incorporation of Oracle protected expression.

And you heard Professor Astrachan talk about what the consequences would be to the industry if something as small as the use of a #include to reference some other software external to the file would make it a derivative work of that file. That's how all software works.

Now, the other kind of common theme I wanted to hit before we dive into the cross-use issues is that we don't come to cross-use with a blank slate.

Your Honor has already made a number of rulings with key portions that bear directly on the issue here today. Your Honor has held in its OSC and in it's summary judgment order Rimini II that Rimini is permitted to create the same update file.

2.2

It can memorize its work product, it can replicate its work. It can reuse work product like test cases. It can develop updates faster. It can perform less testing, use the same test or perform no test at all.

Why are we talking about testing reuse, the knowledge of testing? Oracle's counsel just spent a lot of time talking about where's the evidence of testing, where's the evidence of testing.

Your Honor has already ruled that Rimini can choose to perform less testing or even no testing so why are they talking about testing?

The critical question is not about testing, the critical question is whether Rimini's work product substantially incorporates Oracle expression. That has always been the issue, it is the issue, and so that's what the test for all of these cross-use issues should be.

And for every single cross-use issue, for every single file we're talking about, and we'll go through them in a second, there is no opinion and no evidence that those substantially incorporate Oracle code.

Okay, issue number 3. Issue 3, as you'll recall, this is a slide, just to kind of orient ourselves, it dealt with a W2 form for Johnson Controls. Some of the text was being cut off in two of the boxes.

Now, City of Eugene was affected by the W2 bug.

2.2

It is the City of Eugene, which is in the State of Oregon which is in the United States. City of Eugene was affected by the W2 bug.

Contemporaneous e-mails show Rimini believed the update affected many clients.

City of Eugene contracted for updates to federal forms. Rimini was under a contractual obligation to provide federal form updates. Rimini had provided W2 updates year after year after year including for City of Eugene.

And Ms. Frederiksen-Cross offered no opinion, and it's cited there, no opinion that City of Eugene did not need the bug fix. Oracle's counsel talked about that as if it was some failure of proof on Rimini's part, but, again, it is not our burden.

We actually did affirmatively prove that City of Eugene needed this update, but they can't point and say there's a failure of evidence when their own expert offered no opinion that City of Eugene did not need the bug fix.

Here's the testimony of Jim Benge. He said,

"This is a federal US form, something all of
our clients receive updates for every year. So you
know, we had just gone in and made changes in this
area and thought that we could have introduced a bug
for all our clients. He," that's referring to Don
Sheffield, "was working on the development of this

1 for all of the clients that were impacted, City of 2 Eugene being one of them." 3 Again, it's not our burden, but we met that We have proven that City of Eugene needed this 4 5 update, was affected by this update, and their own expert said 6 that she had offered no opinion to the contrary. 7 E-mails, too, indicate that Rimini believed the 8 bug affected multiple clients. Here are some of the e-mails 9 that we put in evidence. 10 And Professor -- I'm sorry, Barbara 11 Frederiksen-Cross testified that it doesn't matter where 12 Rimini starts the work first, right? They're trying to 13 backtrack from that now, but I asked her, 14 "If City of Eugene and Johnson Controls are 15 both affected by the W2 issue, the misalignment that 16 we saw, do you have an opinion on which client Rimini 17 is required to start its work in?" 18 Her answer was no. 19 "They can start in either one, right?" 20 And, "Presumably, yes." 21 So whether it's two clients or 20 clients, 2.2 Rimini is entitled to start in any client's environment that 23 it believes is affected by the issue. 24 And, remember, Rimini -- and I talked about this 25 in opening a little bit, Rimini is a consultant. Their

2.2

clients don't want to be thinking about tax updates. It's not their core competency.

Rimini is just expected year after year after year, when W2 forms are put out, to implement the update for its client within the US, for the clients it has a contract with, for the clients that -- the clients expect Rimini to do it for.

The clients don't call up Rimini every year and say, "Hey, I need our W2 update." Rimini proactively does it.

And so what's striking about issue 3, what's really striking here, is that this is a pure reuse of knowledge situation. This is a pure reuse of knowledge.

Jim Benge testified,

"So we had a call with the client, and the client actually changed the print parameter for box 17 as we've described, and actually tried it out while we were on the phone with them, and confirmed that it resolved their issue."

Your Honor, Oracle is contending that that is cross-use, the phone call where Jim Benge had a call with a client, the client typed in B99999 and said, "Hey, Jim, I think it works."

They are contending that Rimini is in violation of a federal injunction by having that phone call and talking about B99999 in that print parameter. That's where we are.

2.2

And, in fact, this is how far she took it. She said, "If Don Sheffield" -- I asked her the question,

"If Don Sheffield had figured out the solution for City of Eugene to fix the print parameter, and then his colleague is working in Johnson Controls, and the colleague says to Mr. Sheffield, 'Hey, have you ever dealt with a situation like this,' and he says, 'Yes, actually I have, for City of Eugene, I have changed this print parameter. Go to this field in Johnson Controls and change it to this. I think it should work,' would that be cross-use?"

And Ms. Frederiksen-Cross said, "If he gave him the very specific details of exactly what he changed it to, yes, that is knowledge reuse."

And you know what's interesting is we went through that same issue again this morning, your Honor, and I asked her essentially the same version of this question, and she flip-flopped. She said it's not cross-use any more.

And you saw that actually on redirect, too, where they asked her are any of your opinions based on reuse of know-how, and she denied it, but that's not what she said earlier.

And Oracle's cross-use theory would have truly absurd implications. As we saw, Don Sheffield could never

```
reimplement that solution again. He could never tell a
 1
 2
     colleague about his solution, about his know-how. He could
 3
     maybe say check the print parameter, but he can't tell him to
     use the specific value to put in that parameter?
 4
 5
                   And Professor Astrachan testified, "I don't
 6
     know how they would do that without using the knowledge they'd
 7
               They would have to reuse their knowledge and
 8
     know-how. That's what these cross-use issues are about.
 9
                   In this slide, I think this slide puts in stark
     relief just how much Ms. Frederiksen-Cross contradicts herself
10
11
     and the Court. She said on cross-examination,
12
                  "I would characterize this as cross-use, the
13
          act of reusing the knowledge of the solution."
14
                   Reusing knowledge of the solution.
15
                   And then again later she said that would be
16
     cross-use -- I asked, "That would be cross-use, right?"
17
                   And she said,
18
                  "Yes, if he gave him the very specific
          details of exactly what he changed to it, yes."
19
20
                   And then after all that cross-examination, that
     was sworn testimony, she comes up on redirect, and there was
21
2.2
     one question by Oracle's counsel where she was asked,
23
                  "Are any of your cross-use opinions based on
24
          Rimini's reuse of knowledge?
25
                   "No, I don't believe so."
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Those are directly in conflict. Either that's false statement on the left or it's a false statement on the right. And the Court's order is clear. The Court's order said it is not cross-use for a Rimini engineer to memorize and replicate the work as Oracle claims. Now, let's turn to issue 4, and this slide again is just to orient us. It's Schedule A of Form 940, and, again, the red arrows indicate the Xs that were misaligned. And to start with, the file at issue is ris940a, and that file is Rimini's work product. We proved that. Benge testified about it, Professor Astrachan testified about it. And Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, like I said before, she did not give an opinion on whether that file was substantially similar to any Oracle code. That's a failure of proof. Rimini doesn't have a burden again. We proved that it's our work product. The burden is entirely on Oracle on this issue, and they have no opinion on it. And then the evidence showed that Rimini tested the update in City of Eugene's environment, and it was for

City of Eugene who needed the update.

| Eugene and other clients receive this update every year.

2.2

On January 25th, 2019, I'll go into the timeline in a little bit more detail in a second, when the testing occurred City of Eugene was slated to receive the update, and it's backed up by numerous documents that show this update was slated to go to all US clients with software versions prior to Oracle release 2018-B, and, again, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross offered no opinion to the contrary.

Now, the update was developed and tested for Spherion/Smead. You heard the testimony of Mr. Benge and the testimony of Ms. Davenport as to development and testing.

And now here's the timeline, and our timeline is more detailed than the one Oracle's counsel just showed you.

Oracle has tried to suggest that the key issue here is about someone named Laurie Gardner, who is not a Rimini developer, and why, after client Spherion logged a ticket with Rimini, the scope in Jira was set to Spherion which would be expected when a ticket comes in.

Now, they speculate about what Laurie Gardner saw or knew or intended or heard about the tax publication put out by the IRS. Again, that's burden shifting. Speculation about what Ms. Gardner knew or didn't know, that's not evidence, that's burden shifting.

And they speculate without any evidence whatsoever, there's not been a shred of evidence about whether

2.2

she knew about that IRS instruction that referenced the Virgin Islands, and why -- why? Why does this matter?

Look at the timeline here. The timeline shows
Oracle's speculation is wrong. In July 2018, documents and
testimony show that the update was contemplated for all US
clients. January 2019, all US clients were set to receive it.

On January 14th, yes, Spherion logged a ticket regarding this update, and, yes, the next day the scope field was set to Spherion to reflect that ticket, but that did not change, it was not indicative of what other clients were expected to receive that update.

How do we know that? Because still, on

January 25th, the tech doc reflects that the update will go to
all US clients. Don Sheffield says he's developing the

updates for all US clients that will ultimately get this.

The 28th, the business analyst e-mail reflects the update will go to all US clients.

So before and after this critical ticket from Spherion that came in on January 14th, the documents and testimony show that Rimini expected that City of Eugene, all US clients were going to get this federal form which makes sense because it's a federal form and these are all US clients.

Now, Ms. Frederiksen-Cross accuses reuse of know-how. She tried to disavow that in her redirect, but on

cross she was asked,

2.2

"So even if that Rimini expression -- if the engineer just remembers it, he can't even retype it for Spherion and Smead? That's your opinion?"

And she said, "That would be prohibited."

And, in fact, this morning I asked her those same questions, and, again, it's been a series of backsliding and changing of positions.

I asked can you remember the line code, can you remember this, can you remember that, and she tried to draw a line between, yes, you can remember it but you can't write it down, that's not a distinction, and it directly contradicts your Honor's orders. Your Honor has already ruled that it is not cross-use for a Rimini engineer to memorize the work.

So when I asked her can you remember it and retype it, and she said no, that was in contradiction of your Honor's orders. It is irreconcilable with your Honor's order.

That takes me to issue number 6 regarding the 1099 files. These are the two files, if you recall, rsi1099i, for the 1099 INT, and rsi1099m for the 1099-MISC. Those are, again, obviously both federal forms.

Now, both of those files are Rimini created work product. They're Rimini expression. There's testimony from Jim Benge, there's testimony from Professor Astrachan, and, again, a failure of proof. Ms. Frederiksen-Cross does not

1 contend that they corporate any protected expression. 2 the end of the analysis. 3 Rimini did not incorporate Oracle protected They are Rimini work product. And they were 4 expression. developed and tested for Easter Seals in Easter Seals' 5 6 environments. The documents show that they were. 7 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross offered no opinion on 8 where or when the update was developed other than to 9 acknowledge that it was developed initially pre-injunction. 10 She was asked about this. I asked her a series 11 She said she's not offering an opinion on of questions. 12 substantial similarity. She's not offering an opinion on 13 development. She's not offering an opinion on testing. 14 Again, nothing is our burden here. We have 15 affirmatively proved all these things. Ms. Frederiksen-Cross 16 has not opined on any of them. That's a failure of proof. 17 Now, another key issue with respect to issue 18 number 6 has to do again with the issue of derivative works. 19 And again on the left, I had this in an earlier 20 slide, this is the law. It's clear as day. You have to 21 substantially incorporate protected material from the 2.2 preexisting work, literal or nonliteral. That is the test. 23 And I asked her a clear and direct question. 24 asked, 25 "But that file by itself could also be a

derivative work even if it contains no literal or 1 2 nonliteral Oracle expression whatsoever in your view? 3 "That's my understanding, counsel." That is wrong as a matter of law. 4 5 I asked her when she used and applied that 6 definition in her analysis in this case, and also in Rimini II 7 by the way, and she said yes. That infects every single 8 opinion that she has in this proceeding as well as Rimini II. 9 And so, again, facing a failure of proof, where 10 did Oracle turn this morning? They turned to #include again. 11 They said #include. But #include does not incorporate any 12 Oracle expression until the file is run in the client's 13 environment. 14 Again, the #include in the RSI file is just a 15 single line. It says #include, and then it references a file 16 name. That's it. 17 It's only when that file is sent to the client, 18 compiled and run, is Oracle code even involved in the process. Professor Astrachan explained this, and eventually 19 20 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross admitted this. It's a red herring. 21 Now, I turn to Issue 10. This had to do with 2.2 the issue for Rockefeller and Home Shopping Network. 23 Now, that update involved 13 steps. It was --24 and one step was integrating the rsi quarter tax file which, 25 again, contains no Oracle copyrighted expression.

2.2

Ms. Frederiksen-Cross did not contend that it contained any Oracle copyrighted expression. Again, it's a failure of proof.

And you saw the Dev instruction. We went through it in painstaking detail. It was extremely long. I believe it had 13 steps, it was dozens of pages long, incredibly complex. It had tons of Rimini-written code in it, all Rimini creative expression.

There is not a single opinion from Oracle in this case that that Dev instruction contains any Oracle expression or is substantially similar to any Oracle expression. It is Rimini's work product, and Rimini can use it, yes.

And you saw the testing records. The testing records show that Rimini tested it in Home Shopping Network's environment for Home Shopping Network; in Rockefeller's environment, for Rockefeller.

And so then where did Oracle go faced with this evidence? They went to what I'm calling a retroactive cross-use theory.

I asked Ms. Frederiksen-Cross,

"So if Rimini has just one client, and they're -- we hope to get more clients, we're not sure, and if they do end up getting clients, then somehow it makes the prior use of that first client's

environment cross-use?"

2.2

And her answer was, "That's my understanding just under the way the language of the injunction is framed."

Oracle's theory is so expansive that cross-use somehow runs backwards in time to RAM copies in the first client's environment that no longer exist, so that if Rimini gets a new client next year and reuses its know-how and work product developed in the first client's environment using that first client's software, and therefore there were RAM copies in that first client's environment, those RAM copies are long gone. They've been gone for a year.

But somehow Oracle's cross-use theory is so expansive that it retroactively makes the use of those copies in the first environment somehow illegal, and, again, because the injunction, it's undisputed, only covers illegal conduct, it makes it illegal for anyone.

Now, let's turn to issue 2. Again, this slide is to just orient us again. It's the same Schedule A of Form 940, it's got the boxes and the Xs that are misaligned.

This update was developed for Matheson. The documents show that. It was tested for Matheson. Yes, this is an Apply Update log that shows that the update was sent to Matheson.

But there was the testimony of Jim Benge about

it being tested for Matheson, and Mr. Benge testified, 1 2 "At the time of this informal delivery to 3 Matheson Trucking, did you believe you were violating the injunction? 4 5 "No, not at all. 6 "Why not? 7 "The work that was done here was for 8 Matheson in Matheson's environment." 9 So, again, while we are not rearguing the 10 violation, Rimini did not believe it was in violation of the 11 injunction at the time that this happened and should not be 12 held in contempt because the work for Matheson was in 13 Matheson's environment. The work for City of Eugene was in 14 City of Eugene's environment. And when you look at whether it's developments 15 16 or testing or Rimini expression where the work product at 17 issue, that rsi quarter tax or rsi940 or rsi 1099s, the Rimini 18 expression, we have proven all of those. Again, it is not our 19 burden, we don't have a burden here. 20 But Oracle has failed. Her opinions --21 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross hasn't even offered opinions on whether 2.2 these files substantially incorporate protected Oracle 23 expression, and that's the critical issue here, and Rimini 24 should not be held in contempt for any of these. 25 And I want to turn to issue numbers 7 and 9.

1 These are the two issues regarding JDE source code. 2 Here's the injunction language. "Rimini shall 3 not copy JD Edwards software source code." And here's a demonstrative I showed in opening 4 and you also saw during the testimony of Mr. Lanchak. 5 6 And the red and the green depict the two 7 portions of JDE software. 8 And what's critical with this slide is that, 9 yes, Oracle doesn't like the labels for some reason, but they 10 are not disputing the fact. It's not the term that matters, 11 it's the fact. 12 I asked Ms. Frederiksen-Cross about whether the 13 green portion was accessible human-readable, and she said yes. 14 I asked her about whether some of the components 15 of the software of JDE is not easily accessible and not 16 human-readable, right, that's the red portion. 17 And I have to say Oracle's counsel said that 18 these terms were made up, that they've never been used. 19 documents I referred to in the proffer earlier show that that 20 is not the case. Now, critically, Oracle showed you the jury 21 2.2 instruction for Rimini I, and I want talk about that, because 23 the Ninth Circuit has already held that creating JDE software 24 environments which necessarily, necessarily, includes open and

closed code, is permissible under the JDE license.

25

2.2

That's the Ninth Circuit saying that the Rimini -- the JDE license does not prohibit Rimini from creating JDE software environments.

JDE software environments, it is undisputed, contain both the open accessible portions and the closed inaccessible portions.

And your Honor also heard testimony just this morning about the Giant Cement JDE license, and there was a reference to source code, and what it referred to was the closed code, consistent with Rimini's interpretation. It referred to source code in the context of not decompiling, not reverse engineering, not disassembling.

And so this slide is critical because the Ninth Circuit, it affirmed your Honor's instruction, and it said that when your Honor construed the JDE license, it would not preclude Rimini from creating a development environment for a licensee, for JDE.

And, again, it is undisputed that JDE contains both open and closed code so you cannot create a JDE software environment without copying both of those components.

There's also been a lot testimony and evidence about Spinnaker, and this is Ms. Ransom. She was the Senior Global Vice-President of Customer Support for Oracle, and she was asked a series of questions about Spinnaker's processes.

And she was asked,

1 "And Oracle viewed them as respectful and 2 noninfringing of Oracle's intellectual property?" 3 And she said yes. "And also that the support processes 4 5 described in paragraph 14 do not violate Oracle 6 license agreements with its clients." 7 And she said correct. 8 And what is intriguing is that Oracle's counsel 9 didn't even provide Ms. Ransom's testimony to 10 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross. I asked her about that. 11 She wasn't really aware of what the details 12 were. Oracle shielded their own corporate representative's 13 interpretation of the license at issue from their expert who 14 is here to talk about what is and is not permitted under the 15 license in the injunction. 16 And, again, this is not -- I'll go to this next 17 slide first. So she was also asked the question, 18 "And is it fair to say that Oracle concluded 19 that it was proper for Spinnaker to develop fixes, 20 updates, and custom code solutions -- " that's the 21 open code -- "for its customers that may take the 2.2 form of source code changes?" 23 Her answer was yes. 24 Again, that is the open code that we are talking 25 about.

2.2

And I said this in opening, we're now here in this proceeding and Oracle is saying the exact opposite. They don't say that out in the real world. They don't say that -- now they're saying that the injunction, which only covers illegal conduct, prohibits the copying of Oracle code.

But out in the world, to its licensees, to its partners, to its support providers, to all the consultants that are literally modifying -- you heard them from Mr. Lanchak, modifying and copying JDE code, this open code, they don't tell them that that's prohibited.

And Oracle's assistant general counsel, Deborah Miller, was part of that audit, it was an onsite audit at Spinnaker's processes, and it was concluded that Spinnaker's practices and procedures are respectful of and do not infringe Oracle's intellectual property rights and do not violate the license agreements.

Now, everyone, all the experts and I think all the lawyers, agree that Oracle's theory would prevent support providers from copying, checking out, displaying, checking in, promoting, using tools, or doing anything with JDE code.

And the reason is, is because, in the digital world, you cannot interact with a file, you can't even look at a file without copying code. It's impossible. You can't look at a file without copying code, let alone modify it, let alone create an update.

I asked Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, 1 2 "All of those involve copying of what you 3 contend is JDE source code in the client's environment, correct?" 4 5 The answer was yes. 6 Mr. MacKereth agreed. Mr. Lanchak agreed. You 7 cannot do anything without copying the JDE code. 8 And, again, I've said this before, but your 9 Honor has been crystal clear. The injunction only enjoins 10 conduct that has been adjudicated unlawful. If it's unlawful 11 for Rimini, it's unlawful, period. It's unlawful for 12 everyone. 13 And so if the injunction is interpreted to mean, 14 as Oracle wants, that any and all code, even the open code of 15 JDE that is shipped with the product that is designed to be 16 modified, that Oracle provides tools to modify it, and that 17 has to be modified to keep the software up to date, if that is 18 enjoined, if that is illegal, it would make the JDE support 19 industry suddenly illegal. 20 And Mr. Lanchak, who again is the only person 21 who you've heard from, with decades of experience actually 2.2 implementing Oracle software implementations and maintaining 23 Oracle software and many years of JDE support specifically, that was his testimony. 24

Now, Oracle has tried to suggest that this is

25

2.2

made up, that it's some new-fangled -- I think the word was in opening, new-fangled explanation, some new distinction without a -- that Rimini has never used before, but the timeline disproves that.

Now, they put up a timeline, but, you know, they keep leaving critical things out.

So the injunction was originally issued in October 2016, was stayed roughly two months later in December 2016, and then they did have the portion on 1/8/2018, the portion in black where it says the original injunction was vacated.

But, you know what they left out? They left out that the Ninth Circuit held Rimini can create JD environments. You cannot create a JD environment without copying both the open and closed portions of the code.

And they also left out the testimony of Ms. Ransom four days later. She is the 30(b)(6) corporate designee of Oracle. She said that source code changes and custom code are permissible.

So this is not some made-up story. This is not some new-fangled distinction. These are facts. The fact of the distinction between open and closed, whether you like the terms or not, or whether Oracle likes the terms or not, that doesn't matter. The facts matter.

The Ninth Circuit has held that Rimini can

2.2

create JD environments, and that necessarily requires copying open code.

Now, I also talked in opening about the superfluous argument. Again, this is Oracle's attempted rewrite of paragraph 8.

If Rimini Street can't copy any and all JDE code, even accessible code, it renders the rest of paragraph 10 you see here at the bottom superfluous.

It would be a ban on providing updates so it wouldn't matter -- that portion of paragraph 10 where it says you can't create updates for the benefit of some other licensee, that would be totally superfluous if paragraph 8 is read as Oracle says.

Now, on issue 9, issue 9 concerns the single technical specification at issue, and this issue is moot if the Court finds that Rimini is allowed to access and copy open code to create these markers in the red box.

But those markers aren't code at all.

Mr. MacKereth testified about that. Professor Astrachan

testified about that. I believe even Ms. Frederiksen-Cross

testified that these can't be run, these aren't code, they're

markers, and no one disputed the purpose of them.

That code already exists, or the snippet of code, I should say, already exists in the client's environment. It's used as a frame of reference, a pointer was

2.2

used, an indicator the term was used, a marker the term was used. That is the purpose.

And it is undisputed, again, there is no opinion from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, or evidence to the contrary, that the code in this blue box and the many, many, many, other boxes that have the word "add" in them in this technical specification, that is Rimini-written code. That is Rimini expression, and the fact that there is a snippet, a marker to indicate where to insert that code in a client's environment does not violate the injunction.

And Professor Astrachan, he talked about this, he talked about their purpose, he talked about how it can't be executed and it's not even code.

And, again, there was no opinion from Oracle that these were somehow substantially similar to any Oracle expression, and Professor Astrachan talked about and explained how it was de minimus in any event.

And here's the testimony from

Ms. Frederiksen-Cross on this issue. She agreed that the
snippets are used merely as markers and cannot be executed.

She agreed that Rimini wrote the code to be added, and she
failed to conduct a substantial similarity analysis.

Again, it is not our burden. We have presented affirmative evidence that that is our code, but it is not disputed, and Oracle has a failure of proof issue on all of

```
these that require an analysis of substantial similarity.
 1
 2
                   Now, I want to briefly talk about issue 8. I
     don't believe Oracle's counsel even raised it during their
 3
               Issue 8 relates to the Australian Bureau of
 4
     closing.
     Statistics, ABS I'll call them.
 5
                                      That's a client in Australia.
 6
     ABS uploaded a single database file to Rimini.
 7
                   Oracle's expert admitted she did not disclose
 8
     any opinion regarding database. She was asked,
 9
                  "You have never disclosed any opinion in any
10
          of your reports about this file as it relates
11
          specifically to paragraph 15 of the injunction,"
12
          that's regarding database.
13
                   Her answer, "That's correct."
                   And she admitted that she did not take into
14
15
     account the Court's OSC. She was asked,
                  "You didn't take into account the Court's
16
17
          order on this paragraph in forming your opinions?"
18
                   And she said, "I do not recall that in
          forming my opinions."
19
20
                   And what's she's referring to there is, your
21
     Honor, I had asked her a question about whether she had
2.2
     remembered that your Honor had written in an order that in
23
     context that paragraph 15 did not mean that all copying of
24
     Oracle database was now prohibited, that the injunction had to
25
    be interpreted in the context of this now decade plus
```

2.2

litigation, and your Honor had written explicitly that given that lengthy history, clearly the injunction would not prohibit all copying of Oracle database.

And she did not take that into account in forming her opinions in her case, therefore her opinions are unreliable. She actually didn't have opinions until this hearing, but, in any event, they're unreliable.

They're also wrong because the paragraph 15 of the database -- of the injunction relating to database says,

"Rimini Street shall not reproduce, prepare derivative works from, or distribute Oracle database software."

And so I asked her, "I don't know what your theory is. What is your theory?" I said, "What's your theory as to why this violates paragraph 15 of the injunction?"

And her answer was, "Because it's a copy of the file that is present on Rimini's systems."

In other words, she's saying that there's some local hosting prohibition, an implied one, a silent one that doesn't exist in the text, despite the fact -- again, I've shown this slide before -- that there is no facilities restriction in the OLSA.

And the Ninth Circuit -- I've shown this before -- says that only the PeopleSoft license limits the

licensee to using the licensed software at its facilities which is the basis for the local hosting requirement. The JD Edwards and Seibel licenses don't, and that's why the Ninth Circuit struck those provisions.

Oracle is trying to imply a local hosting prohibition as to database, and it doesn't exist.

Now, I have a very short section on how Oracle's interpretation grossly distorts the junction. It's a text-heavy slide, I admit, I won't go through every piece of it.

But to recap, Oracle is saying that client-sent files weren't contempt when the Rimini I conduct was about environments.

They're saying that with respect to local -with respect cross-use, and the words "for the benefit of,"
that support providers cannot reuse know-how and work product.

They try and sidestep it sometimes. On redirect she claimed otherwise, but there was clear testimony from Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that she was accusing as cross-use the reuse of knowledge.

With respect to JDE, again, Oracle is claiming that support providers can't view, look at, check out, display, check in, or promote any JDE code, and as to database they imply a local hosting prohibition that doesn't exist.

25 It's nonexistent.

2.2

1 Now, I wanted to zoom in a little bit on 2 cross-use, though, again, and I think this point is critical. 3 Rimini should not be held in contempt when Oracle's own expert can't keep Oracle's theories straight and 4 5 doesn't even know what's allowable. She's changed her views. 6 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross has flip-flopped back and forth about 7 know-how. 8 It was acknowledged that there is such a thing 9 as allowable cross-use. That was the testimony. 10 such a thing as allowable cross-use, but we don't know what it 11 is. 12 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross said that Rimini can't reuse knowledge but then said the opposite. I went through 13 14 On cross she said you can't, on redirect she said you 15 can. 16 There was a repeated flip-flop on intent, 17 whether somehow there's some intent element to cross-use. 18 All these issues are up in the air. 19 Ms. Frederiksen-Cross couldn't keep Oracle 20 counsel's theories straight about what is and is not 21 permitted, and so Rimini can't be held in contempt when their 2.2 own expert doesn't know, when it can't be articulated. 23 And that last bullet on the left I think is an 24 important one because there was a glimmer of lucidity there, 25 and there was testimony by Ms. Frederiksen-Cross where she

2.2

eventually said correctly that the line, the critical line here for cross-use is does the work product substantially incorporate protectible Oracle expression.

That is the key to unlocking all of these cross-use issues. That's the key issue when it comes to cross-use, and there's been a failure of proof onto each and every one of these cross-use issues.

I want to briefly touch on the substantial compliance efforts.

Now, Oracle has claimed from the opening, through testimony, and now in closing, that the only two things that Rimini did was to stop using two automated tools, and there was references to Co-Analyzer and DevReview.

They want to rehash the entire history of this litigation when it serves them, but then they want to ignore the history of this litigation when it doesn't. And so what didn't they talk about? They don't talk about Process 2.0.

Your Honor's summary judgment order in February 2014 provided guidance, and what did Rimini do? It followed that guidance. It spent months and millions of dollars moving all of its client systems off of its environment.

For some reason they don't count that, it doesn't count. If it didn't happen within the days after the injunction it somehow doesn't matter.

But Process 2.0 we specifically designed to

2.2

address the issues your Honor had identified in February 2014. So seven years ago Rimini took steps to comply and order its conduct in response to your Honor's instruction in that summary judgment order.

And Oracle also didn't acknowledge that Rimini does instruct clients to not send Oracle IP to them. We saw that. Again, that was the column that was missed apparently inadvertently, even though the column was labeled Important, even though the column -- even though there was testimony by Ms. Frederiksen-Cross that she reviewed each of the column headers.

There was testimony from Mr. MacKereth about scanning and quarantining and discipline, and Oracle wants to just eliminate that, zero it all out.

And they pretend -- I'll just show it one more time. These are the only two things they think happened, but they're not saying the whole story. They're refusing to acknowledge these things on this slide, Process 2.0, scanning, quarantining.

And then I want to just briefly address -- I know Oracle's counsel didn't address it in his last few minutes, but I can't let it go unaddressed a little bit.

Their request for Rimini here is essentially a monitorship. That's unprecedented and it's contrary to law.

They withdrew their request for a bar order,

```
your Honor will remember. It said -- your Honor wrote Oracle,
 1
 2
     in its response to the motion, withdrew its request for a
 3
     complete ban on Rimini support services. But what they're
     doing is they're essentially seeking one again through a
 4
 5
     backdoor by saying all copying is illegal with respect to
 6
     database and JDE.
 7
                   There was this testimony on database where it
 8
     was asked of Ms. Frederiksen-Cross, it says,
 9
                  "It says Rimini shall not reproduce Oracle
10
          database software. What's your understanding of
11
          that?
12
                   "That they shall not copy.
13
                   "Ever?
14
                   "Oracle database software, that would be my
15
          reading of it, yes."
16
                   That would be a ban, that would be a bar on
17
     providing Oracle database support.
18
                   And as to JDE, she was asked,
                  "All of those things involve copying of what
19
          you contend is JDE source code in the client's
20
21
          environment, correct?
2.2
                   "ANSWER: Yes."
23
                   Again, that would effectively be a bar on
24
     providing JDE updates, any meaningful -- in the broadest sense
25
     of the word, any meaningful support.
```

2.2

You heard the testimony of Mr. Lanchak, the only JDE expert in this case, it would prevent meaningful JDE support. It's effectively a bar order. So while they say they withdrew it, they come back to it a different way.

And Oracle is effectively seeking perpetual discovery. They don't want this to end. Rimini is under the yoke of them. They want perpetual discovery, and not just of any, you know, litigant adversary, it's of its biggest competitor.

They want essentially a monitorship. If you saw the things in the opening slides that were presented to your Honor from Oracle's counsel, it had a whole litany of things, essentially a monitorship.

That requires statutory authorization. The Copyright Act does not authorize it. There's no inherent power absent this heightened showing, and there's serious constitutional concerns with it.

And with that, your Honor, I'll conclude.

Rimini respects Oracle's IP, and it respects your Honor's orders. It fundamentally changed its processes more than seven years ago.

It has interpreted the injunction consistent with the Court's ruling that permits lawful support, yes, including the reuse of its own know-how and work product, and that Rimini is in substantial compliance, and we respectfully

ask that at the end of this your Honor discharge the OSC. 1 2 And thank you very much again for your time. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. (Discussion held off the record.) 4 THE COURT: Mr. Isaacson, with that, we'll go 5 6 ahead and turn to Oracle's reply closing argument. 7 Thank you for this last ten MR. ISAACSON: 8 minutes. We have the opportunity to propose trial briefs so I 9 don't have to touch on everything that was just said over the last hour, but I will say that this is not about burden 10 11 shifting, of course it's not. 12 I laid out for you in detail significant proof, 13 clear and convincing proof of not just the violations but of 14 the overall attitude, contemptuous bad faith, and the fact 15 that these are all tied to business practices which indicates 16 that what is happening here are not just the ten violations 17 but practices that are going to continue and be the foundation 18 of part of aspects of the business model that are dependent 19 upon copyright violation and violation of this court order. 20 The last thing that was just said, we are in 21 substantial compliance because we have Process 2.0. 2.2 Seth Ravin explained in his testimony that the 23 Process 2.0 which was adopted before the injunction, as I 24 said, consists of no more PeopleSoft environments, no more 25 general environments on the Rimini system, and we have -- and

they were operating remotely. That's it.

2.2

He said we give warnings. They are boilerplate warnings. They don't respond when they get these materials; please stop.

He said we have scanning. Their witness, Mr. MacKereth, said they adopted that about a year ago.

He said they have quarantining, which their own expert said, "I couldn't see it," and then Mr. MacKereth said there's quarantining, and he pointed to only two SalesForce files.

They said, "We have discipline." And Mr. Benge said he only knows of two cases, maybe there's a third, and, in all the cases he said there were violations of their policy, he could not identify any of that discipline.

I began with JDE because it exemplifies what's going on here. They rewrite the injunction, they ignore the plain words, and they do that in order to commit copyright violations that are now happening after a jury verdict and after an injunction.

Remarkably he stood up here and said the Ninth Circuit says we can create JD environments, and, of course, what did the Ninth Circuit do? It maintained your injunction except for the words "access," which has been blacked out, but otherwise the provision of the injunction with respect to JDE remains the same, and the plain language of that says no

copying of source code.

2.2

And he stood up here and said, yes, source code is human-readable code. Open code is human-readable, closed code is not, and that, of course, is object code.

The plain language of the injunction, which they never came to this Court to seek to modify or clarify or make any of these arguments, instead they contemptuously violated the plain language of that injunction, says they are not entitled to do what they are doing.

There is no explanation that you heard of what happened at the trial. How could that trial have been about closed code that Rimini never used?

There was no explanation of what is the purpose of an injunction after a jury verdict if it's about enjoining something that Rimini did not do and can't do.

The Giant Cement license agreement, which was also touched upon, he said -- he seemed to imply it doesn't talk about source code, it talks about compiling, and there are sections on that.

But the relevant provision in your summary judgment order, which is under Article 2, Sub 3,

"For any access to the software other than by an employee of a customer, customer shall not provide access to source code."

That's what you relied on in your summary

2.2

judgment order, source code in the license, source code in the summary judgment order, source code in the junction, and that's what they're violating.

They're doing the same thing with respect to violation 9 trying to rewrite things which are those tech specifications for JDE where you have markers, where they are using Oracle code for the makers, but they say that's okay because it's not executable source code. That's not what the injunction says. It's another example their rewriting things.

On Issue 1, all that Oracle copyrighted information on the Rimini systems, he said that it's all Oracle database which is not what happened.

What it said was that they were systems that use Oracle database which includes the other products such as PeopleSoft which, as the Court may remember, everything interacts with Oracle database.

There were 934 instances of this type of content on Rimini systems confirmed by Professor Astrachan who said he read the individual SalesForce files on that, and he said it was confirmed by Rimini's assistant general counsel who told them they already knew about that exact number before Barbara Frederiksen-Cross told them about it.

Issue 5, which is -- basically comes down to analytic dissection, I'm not going to repeat the debate that went on today. You heard whole debate about the specifics of

analytic dissection.

2.2

But counsel never confronted the Catch-22 of what they want you to accept from Professor Astrachan, that all code -- software code should be considered to be conventional, and all conventional code should be weeded out by analytic dissection, and nothing should be protected, and therefore we can violate the injunction to our heart's content.

The injunction does not permit that because they've waived any type of argument at the trial that this was not original protectible content.

The jury was instructed, the violation was found, the injunction was entered. They don't get to say we get to copy to our heart's content and come in with analytic dissection.

In addition, his analytic dissection method had no basis in any literature, as he agreed, he made no speeches about it.

He's a remarkably qualified computer scientist, but he's just got this side gig about analytic dissection that has nothing to do with his work. How could it? His method of analytic dissection would make all software not copyrightable because he expects it all to be conventional.

With respect to violations 2 through 4, which this is Form 940, Exhibit A, which went to Spherion/Smead and

2.2

then Matheson, and then there was a bug fix for Johnson

Controls, the Spherion -- all of this took place over a single

weekend in January 2019, and it also however said, as

Mr. Benge said, it represents a business practice because they

feel free to do this.

And what -- just like Mr. Benge, just like

Professor Astrachan, they said this was permissible for all

clients on January 25th, but the record says clear and

convincingly that the test took place on January 24th, and on

January 24th the only -- the only client in scope was

Spherion. That's what it says.

And it is also undisputed, and, you know, counsel said we were speculating, it's not speculation that the documents -- and Mr. Benge said the reason they went to City of Eugene was because they did not have access to Spherion and Smead. It's not because they're trying to help City of Eugene, they don't have access to help the clients who are complaining so they rush over to the easy environment.

They say, well -- they said some things about the AS400 and operating systems which have nothing to do with the PeopleSoft environments or the PeopleSoft updates.

But on this issue of derivative works, we have applied the standard of substantially incorporating protected material.

First, a derivative work is not necessary. A

2.2

modification violates the injunction. The Court has held that in its summary judgment order in Rimini II.

Second, the files in these violations and in violation 6 are derivative works using the analysis of the Court of derivative works in its summary judgment ruling when it applied the *Microstar* decision.

Third, the PeopleSoft environments are also derivative works in the customer environments. Professor Astrachan says that.

He says, however, he thinks that's legal, but they are not because they're a breach of paragraph 2 of the junction because they violate the underlying Easter Seals injunction which says Easter Seals can't create derivative works.

It can -- issue 3, Johnson Controls, he says, well, Johnson Controls needs this, there's lots of evidence. The document says it will depend on what they report -- I'm sorry, he said the City of Eugene needed it, that it was applied given Johnson Controls.

The document says it will depend on what they report. City of Eugene did not report a bug, Johnson Controls did. That's why they used the City of Eugene to help -- to help Johnson Controls.

They say that Ms. Frederiksen-Cross is talking about now the cross-use of knowledge, which is not correct,

2.2

because it was Johnson Controls that identified a problem, that Rimini Street went into the City of Eugene environment to identify a solution to that problem, and then they typed that solution into Johnson Controls. That's cross-use.

And, finally, with respect to Issue 10, the whole -- that long thing about the Dev instructions which was, you know, almost an hour of talking about all these steps in Dev instructions, and he mentions it again, is irrelevant because it was sent to Home Shopping Network -- the update was sent to Home Shopping Network and Rockefeller after development. Rimini provided an update that it developed earlier to the future customers.

He says, well, cross-use can't run backwards, it's a straightforward application of the injunction because the injunction uses the term solely. It is not solely for the benefit of client A if it is being done for future clients.

The injunction talks about it has to be for the benefit of that client A. It is not for the benefit of client A if it is for future clients.

What I have said about what Rimini has done and not done shows bad faith, contempt, a lack of substantial compliance, and ten violations of the injunctions.

But it's not just about those ten things, and counsel was silent about whether somehow these were some ten discrete things or ongoing business practices. That's why you

2.2

didn't hear even a whiff of an apology for a single one of these things.

They are not taking steps to enforce this injunction, they are taking steps to internally say we're going to change this injunction ourselves.

They changed the injunction prohibition on copying JDE source code to nullify it because Mr. MacKereth said he thought reading the injunction to cover the conduct that was held illegal at trial would be incredulous, and Rimini didn't come to this Court to ask permission to do that.

The company that built itself from copyright violations, I'm not just talking about history, I'm talking about today, now says that JDE business -- its JDE business requires it to violate the plain language of a court order which is not what it said when the junction was first entered.

We know that Rimini has 930 files on its system with Oracle copyright notices. That's evidence of lack of substantial compliance. We know their assistant general counsel knew about that.

And we know the violations here are not isolated. The hearing has revealed it's based on business practices, and business practices that they continue to defend, informal testing -- informal delivery to deliver updates by testing from easy environments, delivering testing updates in an easy environment that's not solely for a client,

using technical documents with Rimini code as markers.

2.2

The ten violations in this hearing have uncovered fundamental ways that Rimini is doing business that violates this injunction.

This is not going to stop without serious attention from this Court. It's not just about the ten things because the ten things -- each of the ten things, or most of the ten things, represent serious business practices.

Rimini right now feels free to say that the provisions of the junction are incredulous and then do what it wants.

It will announce after the orders of the Court again that it need do nothing else to comply with the court order as it did before if something isn't done.

It won't compete fairly. It will do so by conduct in violation of a court order if something isn't done. These are very serious matters, because we are discussing a jury verdict, an injunction affirmed on appeal, and Rimini rewriting that to help itself in the marketplace.

Nothing has fundamentally changed with Rimini.

It reveals its business practices only when there's a trial or a hearing. It builds its business on copyright violations and now violations of court orders.

We ask the Court to find Rimini in contempt and to take serious action to address those violations.

```
And, once again, I thank the Court for its time
 1
 2
     this week, and I also thank everybody here who has been
 3
     working very hard.
                               All right. Well, I'll extend an
 4
                   THE COURT:
 5
     appreciation to both counsel. You have done a fine job
 6
     summarizing your clients' cases, and I appreciate the
 7
     professionalism that I've seen throughout the trial, and
 8
     Mr. Vandevelde and Mr. Isaacson, you have reflected that in
 9
     your closing statements.
10
                   A couple of things. First of all, I had earlier
11
     approved a three-week period from the end of this hearing to
12
     submit proposed findings and conclusions of law.
13
                   Madam Clerk, why don't you give me that
14
     three-week date so that we have a specific deadline in mind.
15
                               That would be Tuesday, October 19th.
                   THE CLERK:
16
                   THE COURT: All right --
17
                   THE CLERK:
                               I'm sorry -- yes.
18
                   THE COURT: Yes, I think that's correct.
19
                   That will be the date for that, and, Madam
20
     Clerk, I apologize for not asking you to think about that
21
     earlier.
2.2
                   Let's see.
                               I assume that the slides which have
23
     been referred to by counsel in argument are going to and have
24
     been made a part of the record here somehow. I'd like to have
25
     them as part of the record if they haven't been so submitted.
```

1 Madam Clerk --2 MR. ISAACSON: We handed up our copies. 3 MR. VANDEVELDE: We did, too, and we're happy to -- we're planning to lodge a copy as well, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. And that takes us to the 5 6 other question that was raised earlier about trial date for 7 Rimini II. Do you want to tell me what you're concerned about 8 there? 9 I'm happy -- do you want to MR. VANDEVELDE: 10 start, Bill? 11 I don't have much to say --MR. ISAACSON: 12 THE COURT: I don't mind telling you there's 13 been an obvious hold by the Court, so to speak. 14 I'm sure everyone is aware what the problems are 15 with the COVID-19 pandemic and trying to have jury trials, and 16 I can tell you that it's been a jungle in trying to preserve 17 jury trials for our criminal cases. 18 You can imagine how they're backed up and the complications that that has caused because under the federal 19 20 system there are -- most defendants are being held in custody 21 pending their criminal charges in cases, and I -- it's just 2.2 part of the way things are. 23 On the issue of civil cases, we start with the 24 obvious proposition that this case is definitely unique in the 25 sense that it, like the earlier trial, I foresee a trial which

2.2

easily could go a month, and with the jury under current pandemic conditions, which have only gotten worse in the last month, I'm really hesitant to schedule and be looking at that date.

I can tell you I have other complex civil cases that we have actually set trial dates on, and jury trials, and as I sit here -- when I started this case, I mentioned the double murder trial that we had last month, and we were able to get the jury for that, but it was only a week and a half trial at the same time, but -- and that was not an easy proposition and actually COVID has gotten worse since that trial.

So I'm -- I'm just giving you that as background. I haven't signed off on the pretrial order in this case. We pretty much have what the parties have submitted, and I probably will accept it on that basis without adopting any particular party's position.

But all of that stated, let me hear from counsel.

MR. VANDEVELDE: Your Honor, I have made a proposal, which there's obviously large casts on both sides. We have most of our team here although we are missing one of our key members. I can't speak on his behalf.

I would suggest that maybe we take this offline. We can talk about those and maybe come up with some dates in a

2.2

range. I think there's at least some range that we're largely targeting next year, and hopefully we can come to an agreement.

It would be very hard for me to represent right now that would work given -
THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not trying to pin anyone

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not trying to pin anyone down. I just want you to appreciate the problem from the Court's perspective.

MR. VANDEVELDE: I totally understand.

MR. ISAACSON: You know, we obviously understand those problems and how they come first, your Honor.

And to be totally transparent, the last conversation, which was some time ago, I don't even remember when, quite frankly, hopefully the vaccination rate was lower then, but I don't know, we were talking about April, not anybody agreeing to that, but talking about that, and whether we should set that and then see how things go.

But I don't know if that's how -- that's sort of the way the Court wants to proceed, if we're able to agree on some date range or date.

MR. VANDEVELDE: Yeah. Again, I believe the conversation was with Mr. Thomas who I can't speak on behalf, and he's our lead trial counsel.

I know there are trials, in fact, I have one in May and March, and I know there are other conflicts. I think

```
1
     we can thread the needle somewhere towards early summer,
 2
     midsummer, that's what we were targeting, but I think there's
 3
     common ground for us to discuss, and I think it's easier done
 4
     via phone calls than in open court.
                   I just note that there's lots of --
 5
 6
                   THE COURT: No, I'm certainly not looking for
 7
     dates and ranges right now. I recognize that there's so many
 8
     factors affected, and that's hard to do.
 9
                   Just an observation, I would tell you, just with
10
     the Court's own history in dealing with jury trials during the
11
     pandemic circumstances, I'm really only looking at criminal
12
     cases. It seemed that we had less problems earlier in the
13
     summer, but waiting until summer as I look back at those
14
     cases, but that may just be circumstance, I don't know.
15
                   So give it some thought, let the Court know.
16
     We'll take it from there. I will certainly entertain your
17
     findings and conclusions.
18
                   I appreciate the professionalism I've seen
     throughout this trial, on behalf of the witnesses as well, and
19
20
     we'll decide this matter as quickly as we can expeditiously do
21
     so.
2.2
                   MR. ISAACSON:
                                  Thank you, your Honor.
23
                   MR. VANDEVELDE:
                                    Thank you, your Honor.
24
                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
25
     That will complete this matter as far as evidence and argument
```

```
1
     is are concerned, and I want to thank you once again, and
 2
     you'll be excused at this time, and court will be adjourned.
 3
                           (The proceedings were adjourned.)
 4
                                   -000-
 5
 6
              I certify that the foregoing is a correct
              transcript from the record of proceedings
 7
              in the above-entitled matter.
 8
              /s/Margaret E. Griener
                                          9/29/2021
               Margaret E. Griener, CCR #3, FCRR
 9
               Official Reporter
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		<del></del> 1560-
1	INDEX	
2		
3	DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES:	PAGE:
4	LANCHAK, Stephen	
5	Direct Examination Resumed by Mr. Liversidge Cross-examination by Mr. Hill	1291 1331
6	Redirect Examination by Mr. Liversidge	1346
7	PLAINTIFFS' REBUTTAL WITNESSES:	
8	FREDERIKSEN-CROSS, Barbara	
	Direct Examination by Mr. Smith	1350
9	Cross-examination by Mr. Vandevelde Redirect Examination by Mr. Smith	1411 1451
10	-	
11	DEFENDANTS' SURREBUTTAL WITNESSES:	
12	ASTRACHAN, Owen	1.450
13	Direct Examination by Mr. McCracken Cross-Examination by Mr. Isaacson	1452 1463
14		
15	PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBITS:	
16	68 -	1349
17	1357 through 1362 -	1465
18	DEFENDANTS' EXHIBITS:	
19	46 -	1349
20	733 - 740 -	1349 1350
21		
22	PLAINTIFFS' CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. ISAACSON	1466
23	DEFENDANTS' CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. VANDEVELDE	1499
24	PLAINTIFFS' REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. ISAACSON	1544
25		

				<b></b> 1
,	1459:10, 1459:13,	<b>164</b> [1] - 1321:24	<b>2019</b> [15] <b>-</b> 1356:20,	1311:12, 1312:14,
	1504:8	<b>17</b> [4] - 1367:9,	1357:13, 1361:20,	1322:22, 1354:15,
<b>'90s</b> [1] - 1310:21	<b>1100</b> [1] - 1430:3	1470:7, 1478:6,	1361:24, 1370:14,	1357:17, 1364:16,
<b>'em</b> [1] - 1507:20	<b>1139</b> [1] - 1352:6	1516:16	1374:12, 1449:10,	1364:19, 1371:25,
'Hey [1] - 1517:7	<b>1166</b> [1] - 1345:4	<b>175</b> [8] - 1388:5,	1450:8, 1488:12,	1423:11, 1444:16,
' <b>Oh</b> [1] - 1434:11	<b>118</b> [2] - 1428:18,	1392:13, 1393:8,	1490:12, 1493:3,	1490:21, 1509:22,
'paper [1] - 1319:10	1428:22	1395:22, 1399:23,	1520:2, 1521:6,	1513:21, 1516:10,
'Yes [1] - 1517:8	<b>12</b> [2] - 1321:13,	1456:4, 1459:13	1549:3	1546:21, 1550:15,
163[1] - 1017.0	1464:22	<b>18</b> [10] - 1298:3,	<b>2019s</b> [1] - 1451:2	1559:8
,	<b>120</b> [1] - 1426:13	1314:12, 1328:19,	<b>2020</b> [3] - 1335:11,	<b>3,300</b> [3] - 1427:2,
,	<b>1291</b> [1] - 1560:4	1344:2, 1381:3,	1449:10, 1450:8	1427:5, 1428:2
/s/Margaret [1] -	<b>13</b> [2] - 1524:23,	1396:17, 1396:20,	<b>2020s</b> [2] - 1451:2,	<b>30</b> [1] - 1508:19
1559:8	1525:6	1396:21, 1398:13,	1451:3	<b>30(b)(6</b> [1] - 1533:17
	<b>1331</b> [1] - 1560:5	1424:18	<b>2021</b> [6] - 1290:6,	<b>300</b> [2] - 1301:13,
0	<b>1346</b> [1] - 1560:5	<b>181</b> [1] - 1335:11	1291:1, 1342:7,	1430:1
U	<b>1349</b> [3] - 1560:16,	<b>19</b> [3] - 1353:18,	1403:1, 1451:3	<b>301</b> [1] - 1306:16
<b>000</b> [1] - 1397:21	1560:19, 1560:19	1396:18, 1457:9	<b>203</b> [3] - 1425:24,	<b>302</b> [1] - 1365:2
<b>00P</b> [1] - 1428:11	<b>135</b> [1] - 1458:5	<b>1900</b> [1] - 1463:3	1426:12, 1426:13	<b>34</b> [1] - 1434:4
<b>01</b> [3] - 1387:17,	<b>1350</b> [2] - 1560:8,	<b>196</b> [1] - 1428:22	<b>204</b> [3] - 1428:12,	<b>35</b> [1] - 1434:4
1393:20, 1393:21	1560:20	<b>198</b> [3] - 1425:9,	1428:16, 1428:18	<b>365</b> [1] - 1423:12
<b>02</b> [1] - 1387:17	<b>1356</b> [2] - 1465:3,	1426:14, 1430:15	<b>205</b> [4] - 1376:13,	<b>37</b> [1] - 1296:4
<b>03</b> [1] - 1387:17	1 <b>336</b> [2] - 1465.3, 1465:9	<b>19th</b> [1] - 1554:15	1377:2, 1377:12,	<b>38</b> [1] - 1299:16
<b>55</b> [1] 1001.11		<b>1:20</b> [1] - 1402:23	1377:14	<b>39</b> [2] - 1384:14,
1	<b>1357</b> [1] - 1560:16 <b>136</b> [1] - 1458:8	<b>1:25</b> [2] - 1402:24,	<b>21</b> [1] - 1372:11	1384:24
	<b>1362</b> [3] - 1465:3,	1403:1	<b>22</b> [1] - 1371:25	<b>3:05</b> [1] - 1464:8
<b>1</b> [10] - 1325:14,	,	1400.1	<b>233</b> [2] - 1398:19,	<b>3:10</b> [1] - 1464:8
1325:15, 1340:4,	1465:9, 1560:16	2	1399:19	3.10[i] - 1404.0
1340:5, 1340:11,	<b>137</b> [1] - 1458:8		<b>23rd</b> [3] - 1357:12,	4
1340:13, 1341:7,	<b>139</b> [2] - 1395:8,	<b>2</b> [20] <b>-</b> 1314:4,	1368:24, 1370:13	4
1423:20, 1487:20,	1458:19	1351:10, 1357:17,	<b>24</b> [1] - 1353:15	<b>4</b> [24] - 1321:24,
1547:10	<b>14</b> [10] - 1318:12, 1318:20, 1318:25,	1358:14, 1358:24,	<b>24th</b> [12] - 1361:8,	1330:10, 1357:17,
<b>1,070</b> [4] - 1427:1,		1359:2, 1423:12,	1361:11, 1361:24,	1358:1, 1358:24,
1427:12, 1427:15,	1336:18, 1369:12,	1433:4, 1469:4,	1369:18, 1369:24,	1359:2, 1362:20,
1505:14	1434:4, 1434:5, 1496:14, 1530:5	1482:16, 1484:16,	1370:13, 1493:9,	1362:25, 1363:4,
<b>1,139</b> [3] - 1352:8,	<b>149</b> 0.14, 1530.5 <b>140</b> [2] - 1395:9,	1490:15, 1490:21,	1493:11, 1493:17,	1366:25, 1371:4,
1428:11, 1429:1	1458:5	1497:25, 1498:15,	1494:1, 1549:9,	1372:1, 1372:10,
<b>1-ii</b> [1] - 1311:11	<b>1400</b> [1] - 1412:25	1509:22, 1526:18,	1549:10	1407:23, 1423:12,
1/8/2018 [1] - 1533:9	<b>1411</b> [1] - 1560:9	1546:21, 1548:24,	<b>25</b> [2] - 1306:17,	1478:20, 1490:15,
<b>10</b> [20] - 1301:14,		1550:11	1500:19	1490:16, 1490:21,
1321:25, 1322:23,	<b>1451</b> [1] - 1560:9 <b>1452</b> [1] - 1560:12	<b>2.0</b> [5] - 1540:17,	<b>25th</b> [9] - 1361:8,	1509:22, 1519:7,
1330:4, 1330:13,	<b>1452</b> [1] - 1360.12 <b>1459</b> [1] - 1330:10	1540:25, 1541:18,	1361:16, 1370:13,	1548:24
1330:15, 1331:5,		1544:21, 1544:23	1493:25, 1494:2,	<b>4,481</b> [8] - 1351:22,
1331:6, 1331:11,	<b>1463</b> [1] - 1560:13	<b>20</b> [3] - 1392:15,	1520:2, 1521:13,	1424:10, 1424:18,
1357:17, 1381:17,	<b>1465</b> [1] - 1560:16	1456:4, 1515:21	1549:8	1425:2, 1425:18,
1486:18, 1486:20,	<b>1466</b> [1] - 1560:22	<b>20049</b> [1] - 1372:4	<b>27</b> [1] - 1365:23	1427:11, 1430:11,
1499:9, 1504:9,	<b>1499</b> [1] - 1560:23	<b>2006</b> [1] - 1473:16	<b>28</b> [4] - 1290:6,	1505:12
1509:22, 1524:21,	<b>14th</b> [2] - 1521:7,	<b>2011</b> [6] - 1321:18,	1291:1, 1357:13,	<b>400</b> [1] - 1290:24
1534:8, 1534:10,	1521:19	1337:9, 1337:12,	1403:1	<b>41</b> [1] - 1490:19
1551:5	<b>15</b> [9] - 1306:16,	1337:15, 1450:9,	<b>28th</b> [4] - 1291:7,	<b>43</b> [1] - 1491:11
<b>103</b> [2] - 1440:15,	1321:13, 1402:19,	1487:3	1360:19, 1374:11,	<b>45</b> [1] - 1301:15
1440:22	1403:13, 1477:17,	<b>2013</b> [1] - 1442:3	1521:16	<b>46</b> [2] - 1349:10,
<b>1099</b> [3] - 1292:10,	1536-11 1536-33			
1522:19, 1522:20	1536:11, 1536:23, 1537:8, 1537:15	<b>2014</b> [3] - 1473:17,	<b>29</b> [1] - 1399:22	1560:19
1022.10, 1022.20	1537:8, 1537:15	<b>2014</b> [3] - 1473:17, 1540:19, 1541:1	<b>29</b> [1] - 1399:22 <b>2:10-cv-0106-LRH-</b>	1560:19
1099-MISC [1] -	1537:8, 1537:15 <b>15,000</b> [1] - 1504:9		2:10-cv-0106-LRH-	
	1537:8, 1537:15 <b>15,000</b> [1] - 1504:9 <b>1544</b> [1] - 1560:24	1540:19, 1541:1	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5	1560:19 <b>5</b>
1099-MISC [1] -	1537:8, 1537:15 15,000 [1] - 1504:9 1544 [1] - 1560:24 156 [1] - 1322:22	1540:19, 1541:1 <b>2016</b> [3] - 1357:2,	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5 2a [1] - 1475:17	
<b>1099-MISC</b> [1] - 1522:20	1537:8, 1537:15 15,000 [1] - 1504:9 1544 [1] - 1560:24 156 [1] - 1322:22 15th [1] - 1360:21	1540:19, 1541:1 <b>2016</b> [3] - 1357:2, 1533:8, 1533:9	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5	5
<b>1099-MISC</b> [1] - 1522:20 <b>1099s</b> [1] - 1527:17	1537:8, 1537:15 15,000 [1] - 1504:9 1544 [1] - 1560:24 156 [1] - 1322:22 15th [1] - 1360:21 16 [5] - 1335:11,	1540:19, 1541:1 <b>2016</b> [3] - 1357:2, 1533:8, 1533:9 <b>2018</b> [7] - 1357:4,	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5 2a [1] - 1475:17 2A [2] - 1364:7, 1364:9	<b>5 5</b> [14] - 1328:19,
1099-MISC [1] - 1522:20 1099s [1] - 1527:17 10:40 [1] - 1348:10	1537:8, 1537:15 15,000 [1] - 1504:9 1544 [1] - 1560:24 156 [1] - 1322:22 15th [1] - 1360:21 16 [5] - 1335:11, 1363:11, 1363:18,	1540:19, 1541:1 <b>2016</b> [3] - 1357:2, 1533:8, 1533:9 <b>2018</b> [7] - 1357:4, 1360:19, 1405:12,	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5 2a [1] - 1475:17	<b>5 5</b> [14] - 1328:19, 1359:25, 1375:12,
1099-MISC [1] - 1522:20 1099s [1] - 1527:17 10:40 [1] - 1348:10 10th [2] - 1493:19,	1537:8, 1537:15 15,000 [1] - 1504:9 1544 [1] - 1560:24 156 [1] - 1322:22 15th [1] - 1360:21 16 [5] - 1335:11, 1363:11, 1363:18, 1395:21, 1442:21	1540:19, 1541:1  2016 [3] - 1357:2, 1533:8, 1533:9  2018 [7] - 1357:4, 1360:19, 1405:12, 1450:8, 1486:14,	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5 2a [1] - 1475:17 2A [2] - 1364:7, 1364:9	<b>5 5 13 13 5 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13</b>
1099-MISC [1] - 1522:20 1099s [1] - 1527:17 10:40 [1] - 1348:10 10th [2] - 1493:19, 1493:21	1537:8, 1537:15 15,000 [1] - 1504:9 1544 [1] - 1560:24 156 [1] - 1322:22 15th [1] - 1360:21 16 [5] - 1335:11, 1363:11, 1363:18,	1540:19, 1541:1  2016 [3] - 1357:2, 1533:8, 1533:9  2018 [7] - 1357:4, 1360:19, 1405:12, 1450:8, 1486:14, 1492:25, 1521:4	2:10-cv-0106-LRH- VCF [1] - 1290:5 2a [1] - 1475:17 2A [2] - 1364:7, 1364:9	<b>5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</b>

1496:20, 1498:16, 733 [2] - 1349:17, 1353:11, 1431:8, 1557:19 1344:24, 1345:7, 1498:18, 1506:14, 1560:19 1431:15, 1431:22, above-entitled [1] -1346:4, 1346:9, 1488:19, 1488:24, 1547:23 **74** [1] - 1498:4 1559:7 1346:11, 1347:9 **50** [2] - 1430:2, **740** [2] - 1350:3, 1489:1, 1505:18, ABS [2] - 1536:5, accidental [1] -1465:22 1560:20 1505:23, 1547:17 1536:6 1434:22 50-minute [1] -940 [5] - 1360:22, absence [2] - 1502:7 accommodate [4] absent [2] - 1416:17, 1465:24 1492:22. 1519:8. 1292:24, 1293:12, 8 **500** [2] - 1390:2, 1526:20. 1548:25 1317:2, 1317:14 1543:16 8 [13] - 1330:5, 940A [2] - 1359:3, accomplish [1] -1390:8 absolutely [11] -1330:13, 1330:19, 1360:17 1465:21 **51** [1] - 1384:25 1296:16, 1307:9, 1330:22, 1345:4, **951** [1] - 1381:3 51st [1] - 1292:15 according [3] -1311:7, 1314:11, 1362:22, 1383:13, **960us** [1] - 1478:15 1300:2, 1318:22, 543 [1] - 1328:19 1324:24, 1331:11, 1483:18, 1486:19, **547** [3] - 1398:18, 98 [5] - 1431:21, 1372:3, 1407:7, 1391:15 1534:5, 1534:12, account [4] - 1508:22, 1399:18, 1457:16 1432:20, 1432:23, 1485:6, 1496:18, 1536:2, 1536:4 1433:4 1497:9 1536:15, 1536:16, 548<sub>[1]</sub> - 1457:16 **80** [6] - 1379:19, 999 [1] - 1397:23 absurd [1] - 1517:25 1537:4 **57** [2] - 1395:21, 1379:20, 1383:24, 9:00 [1] - 1291:1 abundance [1] accounts [6] -1399:22 1387:14, 1387:15, **589**[1] - 1392:19 **9s** [1] - 1445:19 1470:11 1292:21, 1292:22, 1387:22 academic [1] - 1479:9 1313:8, 1313:9, **592**[2] - 1392:23, 804 [1] - 1372:11 1313:10 Accenture [2] -Α 1456:8 **806** [1] - 1502:11 accurate [4] -**5:00** [1] - 1403:18 1297:9, 1338:1 844 [2] - 1352:25, **A.M** [1] - 1291:1 1321:16, 1353:10, 5th [1] - 1356:19 accept [4] - 1483:23, 1353:10 A00-MAIN [1] - 1454:6 1360:5, 1381:1 1497:7, 1548:3, 88 [5] - 1387:13, A000 [2] - 1455:2, accurately [1] -1556:16 6 1387:20, 1387:22, 1458:1 1408:24 acceptable [1] -1394:25 **A000-MAIN-EXIT** [1] -6 [16] - 1340:8, 1341:9, accuses [1] - 1521:24 1403:20 **88.2** [2] - 1432:13, 1360:9, 1362:23, 1457:20 Acceptable [6] accusing [2] -1432:24 **AA**[1] - 1397:5 1362:24, 1362:25, 1477:14, 1477:16, 1438:24, 1538:19 **888** [3] - 1400:11, AA000 [3] - 1397:14, acknowledge [3] -1393:17, 1458:4, 1477:23, 1485:11, 1459:14, 1459:17 1398:13, 1398:14 1523:9, 1541:5, 1475:22, 1477:19, 1488:16, 1489:9 **890** [1] - 1400:20 1478:20, 1497:10, AA000-MAIN [5] accepted [3] - 1305:6, 1541:18 893 [1] - 1461:17 1509:22, 1522:18, 1397:10, 1399:8, 1468:4, 1484:22 acknowledged [5] -1523:18, 1550:4 895 [2] - 1401:13, 1454:15, 1454:17, 1501:20, 1508:24, accepts [1] - 1484:4 **60** [1] - 1298:7 1460:24 1454:25 access [41] - 1295:2, 1509:1, 1511:13, 604 [2] - 1410:7, 89501 [1] - 1290:24 AA000-MAIN-EXIT [1] 1539:8 1306:7, 1311:6, 899 [1] - 1462:4 acknowledging [1] -1410:8 - 1399:9 1311:16, 1311:23, **63** [2] - 1385:2, **AAA**[2] - 1397:21, 1400:24 1312:1, 1312:15, 9 1496:23 1398:20 1312:17, 1312:18, acquire [1] - 1328:7 63rd [1] - 1387:9 abbreviate [2] -1312:24, 1313:3, Act [2] - 1292:13, 9 [7] - 1372:11, **68** [4] - 1348:22, 1391:20, 1417:16 1313:5, 1313:9, 1543:15 1348:24, 1349:2, 1381:17, 1499:1, 1313:13, 1313:16, abbreviated [1] act [4] - 1316:12, 1527:25, 1534:14, 1313:18, 1313:19, 1373:3, 1506:22, 1560:16 1394:13 1547:5 69 [2] - 1431:3, 1313:22, 1313:23, abbreviation [5] -1518:13 **9/29/2021** [1] - 1559:8 1329:23, 1329:25, 1497:11 1394:10, 1416:13, acted [1] - 1470:15 90 [9] - 1353:14, 1342:17, 1345:11, 1416:20, 1455:2, 6th [1] - 1356:19 acting [2] - 1473:10, 1405:5, 1405:7, 1345:18, 1477:1, 1456:24 1489:15 1407:22, 1407:24, 1482:17, 1483:13, abbreviations [1] -7 action [6] - 1362:2, 1483:15, 1484:12, 1431:21, 1432:12, 1409:12 1391:4, 1391:5, **7** [8] - 1290:8, 1312:3, 1432:17, 1432:24 1487:12, 1491:9, abiding [1] - 1502:4 1419:25, 1481:5, 900 [2] - 1433:4, 1493:16, 1534:16, 1328:21, 1353:16, ability [7] - 1295:9, 1553:25 1462:16 1545:23, 1546:22, 1381:3, 1396:3, 1296:18, 1323:23, ACTION [3] - 1400:22, 902-6 [1] - 1442:15 1480:14, 1527:25 1546:24, 1549:15, 1324:1, 1324:22, 1400:23, 1420:1 **7-iii** [1] - 1311:12 903 [1] - 1462:8 1329:25, 1414:12 1549:17 ACTION-FETCH [2] -909 [2] - 1459:14, accessed [1] -**71** [1] - 1309:23 able [14] - 1300:6, 1400:22, 1420:1 710[2] - 1429:13, 1462:8 1493:16 1305:6, 1313:15, actions [4] - 1419:5, 919[1] - 1431:22 1355:9, 1367:20, accessible [6] -1430:9 1437:13, 1461:22, 716[1] - 1349:18 929 [1] - 1353:15 1293:12, 1306:10, 1373:12, 1412:3, 1461:24 1528:13, 1528:15, **72** [3] - 1380:11, 930 [2] - 1353:15, 1437:13, 1438:8, activities [1] - 1360:14 1383:17, 1383:20 1552:16 1463:20, 1492:8, 1529:5, 1534:7 actual [7] - 1346:22, 72nd [1] - 1384:3 934 [12] - 1353:1, 1499:4, 1556:8, accessing [6] -1388:24, 1396:7,

1494:9, 1500:6, agreements [18] alluding [1] - 1330:15 analyze [1] - 1474:24 adopting [2] -1504:6, 1505:3 1484:10, 1556:17 1320:21, 1323:4, almost [4] - 1406:12, analyzed [4] adapted [1] - 1379:2 advance [1] - 1360:14 1338:13, 1338:18, 1430:2, 1489:8, 1355:20, 1506:16, add [9] - 1292:20, adversary [1] - 1543:8 1338:22, 1338:25, 1551:7 1506:20. 1508:6 1292:21. 1293:5. adviser [1] - 1298:6 1339:11, 1339:12, alone [2] - 1531:24 Analyzer [1] - 1540:13 1315:15. 1315:21. advocates [1] - 1494:5 1339:16, 1339:19, alpha [1] - 1397:18 ancestor [1] - 1385:16 1317:4, 1317:5, 1339:23. 1339:25. affect [2] - 1366:8, alpha-numeric [1] -Andersen [1] -1343:25. 1344:4. 1367:5, 1535:6 1497:17 1397:18 1316:16 added [5] - 1293:2, 1344:10, 1344:15, affected [10] alphabetic [5] annotation [1] -1530:6, 1531:16 1293:8, 1387:7, 1364:22, 1364:25, 1384:22, 1397:17, 1382:5 agrees [3] - 1435:21, 1535:21 1513:25, 1514:2, 1398:8, 1399:18, announce [1] -1459:21, 1482:16 addition [3] - 1410:20, 1514:5, 1515:5, 1419:16 1553:12 ahead [12] - 1348:16, 1488:18, 1548:16 1515:8, 1515:15, alphabets [1] - 1398:7 announced [1] -1349:21, 1402:23, additional [7] -1515:23, 1558:8 alphanumeric [1] -1360:16 1403:12, 1404:12, 1292:22, 1293:11, **affidavits** [1] - 1473:2 1384:22 announcement [1] -1411:16, 1452:13, 1302:1, 1316:19, affiliates [1] - 1346:11 alters [1] - 1497:20 1361:6 1463:11, 1464:14, 1353:14, 1369:23, affirmatively [2] ambiguous [1] announcements [1] -1396:8 1466:5, 1499:23, 1514:15, 1523:15 1472:2 1493:5 1544:6 address [8] - 1435:15, affirmed [2] - 1529:14, ANSWER [13] -Ames [1] - 1316:23 aid [1] - 1295:19 1444:21, 1467:12, 1553:18 amount [4] - 1375:13, 1302:5, 1302:13, 1500:22, 1541:1, air [4] - 1402:10, Affordable [1] -1379:18, 1393:7, 1302:15, 1306:22, 1541:20, 1541:21, 1421:23, 1421:24, 1292:13 1399:24 1308:14, 1308:18, 1553:25 1539:18 1322:8, 1323:2, afoul [1] - 1450:22 analogy [1] - 1459:1 al [2] - 1290:4, 1290:7 addressed [6] -1323:6, 1329:3, afternoon [6] -Analysis [3] - 1493:4, 1393:19, 1394:2, align [1] - 1385:7 1329:10, 1335:16, 1403:22, 1403:23, 1493:19, 1493:21 1438:21, 1466:12, aligned [7] - 1383:1, 1452:14, 1452:16, 1542:22 analysis [33] -1466:22. 1476:6 1383:4, 1384:11, 1463:8, 1463:12 1317:22, 1334:8, answer [22] - 1299:1, 1384:13, 1384:24, addresses [1] ago [11] - 1338:20, 1334:14, 1334:19, 1301:18, 1301:23, 1384:25, 1385:2 1401:14 1354:19, 1392:21, 1334:22, 1335:22, 1305:21, 1333:12, addressing [3] aligning [1] - 1387:1 1353:20, 1366:12, 1392:23, 1426:6, 1336:3, 1336:11, 1393:18, 1464:24, alignment [10] -1367:6, 1413:15, 1479:3, 1503:23, 1336:14, 1351:14, 1379:23, 1380:2, 1499:19 1413:17, 1420:6, 1541:2, 1543:21, 1376:19, 1378:22, adequate [1] -1380:17, 1382:6, 1421:6, 1427:4, 1545:6. 1557:13 1379:9. 1379:12. 1383:4, 1385:1, 1446:11 agree [21] - 1307:1, 1380:5, 1380:7, 1449:5, 1450:11, 1385:11, 1387:9, adhering [1] - 1389:18 1515:18, 1526:2, 1308:23, 1308:24, 1380:13, 1382:22, adjourned [2] -1387:13, 1415:24 1530:23, 1532:5, 1330:7, 1354:4, 1406:21, 1445:2, 1559:2, 1559:3 alleged [3] - 1435:6, 1536:13, 1537:17 1359:16, 1363:21, 1453:5, 1492:3, 1437:17, 1439:14 adjudicated [2] -1378:25, 1381:7, 1492:16, 1492:17, answered [3] -1487:18, 1532:10 1385:22, 1389:15, allegedly [2] - 1424:9, 1505:17, 1508:13, 1420:11, 1420:18, 1401:24, 1406:13, 1430:10 adjusting [1] -1508:14, 1508:18, 1498:23 1453:23 Allen [1] - 1290:19 1523:2, 1524:6, answering [1] -1427:14, 1432:4, admissible [2] -1453:2, 1462:25, allocate [1] - 1317:12 1535:22, 1536:1, 1421:5 1442:9, 1443:4 allow [13] - 1299:1, 1550:4 anticipate [2] -1463:15, 1488:24, 1305:21, 1324:5, admit [4] - 1340:18, 1347:22, 1404:3 1531:18, 1557:19 analyst [2] - 1303:2, 1341:3, 1365:13, 1341:4, 1465:3, anticipated [1] agreed [15] - 1348:23, 1521:16 1538:9 1368:16, 1368:18, 1348:5 1356:14, 1356:17, analysts [3] - 1302:21, admits [4] - 1470:16, 1387:7, 1408:5, anytime [1] - 1375:8 1479:25, 1481:1, 1360:25, 1361:5 1412:21, 1419:19, 1497:9, 1497:19, 1483:6, 1483:7, analytic [24] - 1376:8, API [11] - 1390:2, 1441:17, 1449:2 1390:4, 1390:18, 1497:22 1488:21, 1490:13, 1376:21, 1377:20, allowable [4] -1492:23, 1532:6, admitted [13] - 1320:3, 1378:25, 1384:16, 1393:2, 1395:13, 1535:19, 1535:21, 1322:18, 1539:5, 1348:25, 1349:8, 1399:25, 1400:3, 1401:7, 1401:9, 1539:9, 1539:10 1349:14, 1349:16, 1548:17 1460:15, 1474:20, 1401:11, 1401:14, 1350:2, 1488:15, agreeing [1] - 1557:16 allowed [6] - 1311:24, 1475:7, 1475:12, 1460:6 1504:11, 1505:16, agreement [12] -1328:24, 1435:22, 1496:16, 1496:18, APIs [2] - 1441:17, 1508:21, 1524:20, 1440:4, 1444:11, 1506:16, 1506:18, 1507:14 1308:12, 1338:10, 1536:7, 1536:14 1534:16 1507:2, 1507:12, 1341:15, 1341:22, apologize [5] -1341:24, 1342:12, allowing [1] - 1465:12 1547:24, 1548:1, adopt [1] - 1484:9 1464:20, 1464:23, allows [3] - 1295:17, 1548:6, 1548:14, adopted [4] - 1471:1, 1343:9, 1343:13, 1464:25, 1467:10, 1485:23, 1544:23, 1343:14, 1343:16, 1295:18, 1414:15 1548:16, 1548:20, 1554:20 1545:6 1546:16, 1557:3 alluded [1] - 1394:9 1548:22 apology [1] - 1552:1

apparent [1] - 1370:23 appropriate [3] -**AS400** [2] - 1511:14, asterisk [10] attachments [2] -1549:20 appeal [1] - 1553:18 1368:4, 1471:8, 1380:22, 1381:6, 1431:8, 1431:22 appear [7] - 1363:23, 1484:14 aspect [2] - 1388:23, 1381:12, 1381:13, attempt [2] - 1310:6, 1377:19, 1384:6, approval [1] - 1484:8 1389:3 1381:21, 1396:3, 1502:13 1400:7, 1410:25, approved [1] aspects [2] - 1380:15, 1455:7, 1455:11, attempted [4] -1422:10, 1493:10 1554:11 1544.18 1455:25 1444:24, 1491:2, asterisks [7] -APPEARANCES[1] -April [1] - 1557:15 assent [1] - 1502:6 1507:17, 1534:4 assert [1] - 1416:8 1381:24, 1396:5, 1290:13 architectural [2] attention [15] -1415:17, 1415:19, append [2] - 1391:20, 1306:8, 1310:18 asserted [1] - 1442:17 1303:16, 1365:4, 1455:14, 1507:25, 1398.7 archival [2] - 1481:16, assertions [1] -1365:22, 1392:13, 1509:9 appendix [1] -1481:20 1473:1 1395:21, 1396:17, Astrachan [60] -1477:23 area [5] - 1315:3, assess [2] - 1354:21, 1407:22, 1410:7, Application [1] -1401:23, 1457:9, 1332:4, 1352:25, 1422:18, 1466:8, 1380:20 1353:7, 1375:18, 1341:11 1496:22, 1514:23 assessed [1] -1466:12, 1470:5, application [17] -1376:8, 1376:15, 1499:18, 1500:1, areas [1] - 1387:16 1316:24 1376:17, 1376:24, 1553.6 1297:7, 1302:23, arguably [1] - 1382:11 assigned [2] -1379:8, 1381:4, attitude [2] - 1471:21, 1303:5, 1307:5, 1394:21, 1421:14 argue [1] - 1474:19 1383:9, 1385:2, 1544:14 1315:14, 1315:24, argued [5] - 1442:11, assigning [1] -1385:22, 1386:5, 1325:10, 1325:22, attorneys [1] -1474:4, 1482:1, 1419:24 1389:24, 1389:25, 1464:22 1326:1, 1331:4, 1484:1, 1487:5 assignments [1] -1390:10, 1390:17, 1341:14, 1414:1, Attorneys [2] arguing [4] - 1440:23, 1395:1 1441:11, 1441:14, 1393:6, 1393:17, 1290:17, 1290:21 1481:23, 1491:17, assistant [5] -1497:17, 1551:14 1399:23, 1400:4, attract [1] - 1467:17 1499:10 1427:25, 1489:2, 1401:24, 1404:17, applications [5] audit [4] - 1320:12, ARGUMENT [3] -1531:11, 1547:20, 1406:12, 1407:8, 1292:16, 1325:2, 1321:18, 1531:12 1560:22, 1560:23, 1552:18 1433:21, 1451:19, 1339:20, 1339:21, augment [1] - 1388:15 1560:24 assisted [1] - 1429:17 1452:4, 1452:15, 1481:3 argument [8] assists [2] - 1293:18, augmentation [1] -1454:8, 1479:2, applied [11] - 1304:22, 1361:22, 1442:24, 1294:15 1389:8 1485:12, 1488:20, 1366:4, 1375:21, 1484:3, 1534:4, Associate [1] - 1320:5 augments [2] -1489:1, 1489:6, 1379:4, 1478:10, 1544:6, 1548:10, 1388:10, 1388:19 associated [19] -1490:8, 1491:17, 1492:3, 1508:21, 1293:6, 1293:9, 1554:23, 1558:25 August [4] - 1356:19, 1492:4, 1494:2, 1524:5, 1549:23, 1327:22, 1331:1, 1357:12, 1488:12, arguments [5] -1494:7, 1496:15, 1550:6, 1550:19 1490:12 1471:17. 1475:3. 1331:3, 1356:5, 1497:9, 1497:13, applies [6] - 1345:14, 1485:5, 1486:16, **Australia** [1] - 1536:5 1359:18, 1361:25, 1500:16, 1506:16, 1345:23, 1474:13, 1546:7 1364:20, 1365:14, Australian [1] - 1536:4 1506:20, 1508:5, 1474:17, 1487:4, arise [1] - 1468:16 authenticating [1] -1395:2, 1404:18, 1512:13, 1518:5, 1492:17 arose [1] - 1446:17 1404:19, 1405:19, 1442:14 1519:12, 1522:24, Apply [2] - 1371:8, authorization [1] arounds [1] - 1319:4 1408:17, 1410:9, 1524:19, 1534:19, 1526:23 1432:7, 1432:9, arranged [1] - 1388:24 1543:14 1535:11, 1535:16, apply [6] - 1345:22, 1476:10 authorize [1] arrangements [2] -1547:18, 1548:3, 1360:17, 1368:7, 1343:18, 1343:25 association [2] -1543:15 1549:7, 1550:9 1378:8, 1483:5, arriving [1] - 1368:8 1384:9, 1387:21 authorized [1] -ASTRACHAN[2] -1487:3 arrow [1] - 1509:16 assume [10] -1361:3 1452:10, 1560:12 applying [3] - 1336:1, 1341:23, 1361:22, automated [1] arrows [1] - 1519:9 Astrachan's [16] -1399:24. 1492:18 1402:21, 1417:17, 1540:12 artfully [1] - 1307:3 1350:19, 1353:17, appreciate [7] -1417:18, 1436:11, automatic [1] - 1505:4 Arthur [1] - 1316:16 1356:1, 1359:22, 1349:1, 1443:6, 1447:2, 1462:21, automation [3] article [5] - 1441:2, 1360:3, 1361:9, 1465:13, 1500:3, 1465:23, 1554:22 1373:25, 1374:3, 1441:7, 1441:9, 1375:14, 1377:17, 1554:6, 1557:7, assumed [1] - 1462:19 1374:19 1441:22, 1443:2 1378:23, 1380:4, 1558:18 assuming [11] available [5] -Article [2] - 1482:16, 1380:20, 1385:18, appreciates [1] -1330:17, 1346:2, 1546:21 1306:13, 1306:20, 1386:2, 1389:11, 1500:1 1353:10, 1356:11, 1352:16, 1410:3, articulated [1] -1390:1, 1437:19 appreciation [1] -1385:4, 1404:2, 1413:6 1539:22 atop [1] - 1377:7 1554:5 1415:17, 1415:23, aversion [1] - 1456:23 articulates [1] attached [4] approach [2] - 1328:7, 1447:6, 1448:14, avoid [1] - 1481:18 1375:24 1426:15, 1428:23, 1331:16 1450:24 aware [16] - 1308:11, **AS-1400** [2] - 1411:20, 1436:16, 1437:3 approaches [1] assumption [2] -1308:16, 1328:10, 1412:13 attachment [4] -1389:21 1462:25, 1463:1 AS-400 [5] - 1412:25, 1379:5, 1380:23, 1355:3, 1436:22, approaching [1] assurance [2] -1405:9, 1408:20, 1413:8, 1413:9, 1437:1, 1437:2 1306:4 1375:2, 1500:11 1413:10, 1433:23, 1413:12, 1414:22

1434:1, 1443:18, 1351:20, 1353:12, 1505:21 bind [2] - 1391:5 1455:11, 1455:22, 1443:21, 1443:25, 1356:10, 1361:4, benefit [10] - 1304:17, 1503:17, 1509:9, bind-data [1] - 1391:5 1362:19, 1375:5, 1362:12, 1363:24, 1444:10, 1530:11, bind-setup [1] -1516:15, 1534:17, 1555:14 1410:25, 1431:5, 1475:23, 1477:2, 1391:5 1535.5 awhile [1] - 1465:1 1432:7, 1447:3, 1534:11, 1538:15, binder [2] - 1340:5, boxes [12] - 1380:21, 1466:25, 1467:3, 1551:16, 1551:18 1340:11 1381:6, 1381:11, 1467:5, 1467:13, Benge [32] - 1372:2, 1382:4. 1382:9. В binders [1] - 1331:17 1469:10, 1474:1, 1372:7, 1374:1, 1393:20. 1397:3. Bingham [1] - 1320:11 B999 [4] - 1447:1, 1479:21, 1482:21, 1374:9, 1374:20, 1455:7, 1455:14, bio [5] - 1316:24, 1447:2, 1448:1, 1491:16, 1494:8, 1404:17, 1470:7, 1513:24, 1526:20, 1317:2, 1317:8, 1501:24, 1507:2, 1448:7 1470:22, 1475:25, 1535:6 1317:11, 1317:15 B9999 [1] - 1445:16 1509:13, 1517:21, bracket [1] - 1399:15 1477:15, 1478:6, bio-diesel [5] -**B99999** [2] - 1516:21, 1518:23, 1552:21 1488:16, 1489:11, bracketed [1] - 1397:7 1316:24, 1317:2, bases [1] - 1406:6 1516:25 1490:5, 1493:24, 1317:8, 1317:11, brazen [1] - 1466:19 basis [22] - 1416:4, B999999.99 [2] -1494:7, 1494:12, brazenly [1] - 1481:23 1317:15 1418:2, 1418:7, 1366:3, 1368:8 1495:3, 1496:5, breach [1] - 1550:11 bit [21] - 1294:23, backdoor [1] - 1542:5 1418:16, 1418:19, 1500:9, 1514:19, break [18] - 1324:22, 1295:1, 1315:4, backed [5] - 1508:25, 1419:8, 1420:8, 1516:13, 1516:20, 1324:25, 1325:1, 1335:4, 1336:8, 1420:13, 1420:15, 1519:12, 1520:10, 1509:10, 1509:12, 1344:1, 1369:7, 1325:19, 1326:2, 1522:24, 1526:25, 1420:17, 1425:2, 1520:5, 1555:18 1326:17, 1329:19, 1369:19, 1374:4, 1527:1, 1545:11, background [3] -1426:1, 1430:22, 1333:22, 1335:8, 1400:5, 1409:3, 1440:23, 1494:16, 1549:4, 1549:6, 1472:17, 1480:17, 1335:14, 1348:14, 1409:4, 1409:13, 1549:14 1556:14 1496:2, 1505:12, 1402:20, 1402:23, 1423:3, 1450:15, backsliding [1] -1508:1, 1509:18, Benge's [4] - 1359:11, 1451:9, 1480:12, 1403:6, 1463:8, 1538:2, 1548:17, 1373:2, 1408:16, 1522:7 1464:7, 1464:12, 1515:25, 1520:3, 1556:16 1410:22 backtrack [1] -1539:1, 1541:22 1495:17 **bat** [3] - 1348:15, Benjamin [1] -1515:13 breaks [1] - 1506:25 black [1] - 1533:10 1350:9, 1350:10 1290:14 backwards [2] -Brenda [1] - 1500:11 blacked [1] - 1545:23 batch [1] - 1494:21 best [2] - 1413:16, 1526:6, 1551:13 brief [3] - 1441:1, blank [2] - 1365:12, Bates [2] - 1303:22, 1470:23 bad [8] - 1325:18, 1443:5, 1501:21 1512:20 1441:24 better [3] - 1389:22, 1396:21, 1473:25, briefly [10] - 1346:15, blinking [1] - 1459:1 battle [1] - 1474:18 1399:3, 1426:2 1477:13, 1478:2, blow [5] - 1369:4, 1354:16, 1358:5, bear [1] - 1512:22 between [25] -1478:25, 1544:14, 1409:2, 1434:5, 1381:17, 1393:12, BearingPoint [1] -1301:16, 1302:3, 1551:21 1454:5, 1458:5 1501:17, 1509:24, 1304:6, 1337:18, balance [1] - 1506:1 1338:1 1536:2, 1540:8, blue [2] - 1510:11, became [2] - 1311:1, 1366:17, 1367:3, ban [3] - 1534:9, 1541:20 1535:5 1475:24 1371:6, 1371:19, 1542:3, 1542:16 briefs [3] - 1482:3, boilerplate [3] bandwidth [1] become [1] - 1292:14 1382:18, 1382:19, 1482:5, 1544:8 1489:20, 1490:2, 1385:13, 1386:7, 1316:14 **BEFORE** [1] - 1290:2 bring [11] - 1295:4, 1545:2 1388:1, 1399:16, banning [4] - 1323:21, began [3] - 1463:15, 1301:10, 1303:21, bolt [2] - 1306:9, 1402:23, 1406:21, 1330:19, 1330:22, 1501:14, 1545:15 1308:7, 1309:3, 1317:16 1415:2, 1415:8, 1331:4 begin [4] - 1454:24, 1320:10, 1321:12, borderline [1] -1453:6, 1453:11, 1455:17, 1465:18, bar [4] - 1541:25, 1328:18, 1330:9, 1416:17 1464:8, 1487:10, 1542:16. 1542:23. 1490:16 1345:3, 1373:22 bottom [15] - 1365:5, 1495:17, 1522:11, 1543:3 beginning [7] brings [2] - 1492:19, 1368:22, 1381:8, 1533:22 BARBARA[1] -1352:3, 1368:12, 1498:4 1381:20, 1381:23, beyond [14] - 1374:4, 1381:5, 1399:16, 1350:15 **broad** [1] - 1466:19 1390:21, 1390:22, 1420:22, 1421:1, Barbara [6] - 1480:4, 1432:16, 1455:22, broader [2] - 1423:3, 1393:16, 1396:17, 1421:9, 1421:20, 1472:21 1480:5, 1488:18, 1396:20, 1426:16, 1423:9 1430:20, 1430:25, behalf [11] - 1291:17, 1515:10, 1547:21, broadest [1] - 1542:24 1426:25, 1429:9, 1437:15, 1438:20, 1347:23, 1348:5, 1560:8 1502:7, 1534:8 broadly [2] - 1362:11, 1439:22, 1440:17, 1350:15, 1362:7, bare [1] - 1421:12 1379:4 box [25] - 1317:15, 1448:19, 1501:23, base [1] - 1294:13 1362:12, 1362:13, 1360:17, 1364:20, brought [5] - 1500:7, 1509:17 1452:10, 1556:23, Based [1] - 1320:16 1367:9, 1369:12, 1500:9, 1500:11, **big** [3] - 1315:7, 1557:22, 1558:19 1500:14, 1500:15 based [37] - 1294:8, 1370:6, 1381:13, 1339:5, 1509:8 behind [1] - 1389:19 1294:14, 1298:14, 1381:20, 1381:22, Buffy [2] - 1318:5, biggest [1] - 1543:8 believes [3] - 1467:2, 1299:1, 1300:17, 1381:23, 1382:2, 1349:24 bill [1] - 1472:6 1468:23, 1515:23 1304:16, 1305:17, 1382:4, 1382:6, bug [14] - 1375:8, Bill [1] - 1555:10 1326:3, 1334:4, below [4] - 1343:6, 1396:5, 1396:6, 1495:2, 1495:21, bills [1] - 1325:16 1334:8, 1334:10, 1393:22, 1397:4, 1396:7, 1455:6, 1495:22, 1495:23,

1496:1, 1513:25, 1529:19, 1531:22, 1555:24, 1556:7, 1367:10, 1367:11, businesses [2] -1514:3, 1514:12, 1359:3, 1360:17 1532:7, 1533:14, 1556:15 1367:12, 1367:25, 1514:18, 1514:23, Butler [4] - 1353:8, 1535:20, 1538:16 case-by-case [2] -1368:13, 1369:16, 1515:8, 1549:1, 1356:2, 1451:25, capacity [2] - 1297:24, 1416:4, 1496:2 1369:20, 1370:2, 1550:21 1489.2 1300:6 cases [25] - 1379:6, 1370:4, 1380:7, build [3] - 1317:15, buy [1] - 1328:8 Capgemini [1] -1416:8, 1416:9, 1404:17, 1449:11, 1467:3. 1484:24 1297:9 1419:3, 1436:9, 1450:7, 1451:2, BY [78] - 1291:20, **building** [1] - 1329:17 1451:3, 1469:22, capital [1] - 1391:12 1436:17, 1439:1, 1292:3, 1293:24, cards [1] - 1383:23 1439:4, 1439:9, 1517:11, 1521:10, builds [1] - 1553:22 1296:6, 1299:3, 1552:5 1439:12, 1466:19, built [4] - 1466:20, Care [1] - 1292:13 1299:18, 1301:12, changed [16] -1489:18, 1491:17, 1473:17, 1474:1, 1305:10, 1305:22, career [2] - 1302:8, 1504:7, 1513:3, 1361:12, 1361:15, 1552:11 1306:18, 1308:9, 1313:23 1545:12, 1545:13, 1380:8, 1404:21, **bullet** [2] - 1509:7, 1309:24, 1311:13, carriers [1] - 1317:13 1470:16, 1472:5, 1554:6, 1555:17, 1539:23 1318:13, 1318:21, carries [1] - 1303:9 1473:19, 1516:15, bundle [1] - 1404:18 1320:6, 1321:14, 1555:21, 1555:23, carry 131 - 1345:12. 1556:5, 1558:12, 1517:9, 1517:15, 1324:8, 1328:20, burden [27] - 1469:5, 1482:11, 1482:18 1558:14 1518:19, 1539:5, 1330:11, 1331:22, 1469:15, 1501:17, case [92] - 1293:25, 1334:18, 1335:12, 1302:14, 1304:4, Casey [1] - 1290:21 1543:20, 1552:6, 1501:19, 1502:2, 1553:20 1502:9, 1502:13, 1336:19, 1341:6, casts [1] - 1556:21 1307:7, 1307:24, changes [29] - 1292:9, 1342:4, 1343:22, catastrophic [1] -1502:17, 1502:22, 1309:9, 1310:11, 1292:10, 1292:11, 1345:5, 1345:21, 1502:25, 1503:3, 1325:4 1310:16, 1317:25, 1292:15, 1293:1, 1503:4, 1503:7, 1346:17, 1350:18, catch [2] - 1396:14, 1318:8, 1321:1, 1295:4, 1314:20, 1503:8, 1514:14, 1351:13, 1355:18, 1396:23 1322:11, 1334:11, 1358:2, 1360:1, 1315:23, 1319:8, 1515:3, 1515:4, Catch-22 [2] -1348:1, 1348:19, 1519:18, 1519:19, 1360:10, 1363:1, 1496:23, 1548:2 1319:9, 1319:18, 1350:5, 1356:7, 1364:10, 1365:3, 1319:19, 1322:5, 1520:21, 1520:23, 1356:18, 1356:22, caused [1] - 1555:19 1370:1, 1386:4, 1322:6, 1322:17, 1523:14. 1527:19. 1357:1, 1357:17, caution [1] - 1470:11 1535:23, 1544:10 1388:6, 1394:4, 1337:5, 1337:8, 1366:22, 1368:5, CCR [2] - 1290:23, 1404:15, 1405:6, 1361:16, 1468:17, burden-shifting [1] -1370:23, 1376:5, 1559:8 1411:18, 1412:9, 1469:20, 1471:14, 1503:3 1376:9, 1376:19, Cement [5] - 1309:6, 1413:7, 1420:14, 1514:22, 1530:22, Bureau [1] - 1536:4 1377:13, 1379:22, 1482:14, 1487:8, 1533:18 1421:8, 1423:14, business [52] -1392:10, 1394:14, 1529:8, 1546:16 changing [2] -1423:21, 1425:11, 1292:8, 1292:19, 1396:8, 1397:3, Center [1] - 1355:13 1426:17, 1428:6, 1449:10, 1522:8 1398:7, 1399:8, 1292:22, 1293:5, CEO [6] - 1318:24, 1428:17, 1428:24, character [6] -1293:11, 1295:5, 1400:23, 1404:3, 1469:23, 1471:24, 1429:10, 1431:4, 1379:18, 1379:19, 1295:20, 1295:21, 1405:16, 1406:3, 1484:23, 1486:2, 1379:20, 1383:12, 1433:9, 1434:6, 1315:16, 1316:24, 1406:4, 1406:5, 1493:10 1435:13, 1436:2, 1419:16, 1419:17 1326:25, 1328:5, 1416:4, 1416:18, certain [17] - 1304:16, 1439:18, 1443:15, characteristics [3] -1328:6, 1338:13, 1417:2, 1422:20, 1313:3, 1313:4, 1444:19, 1449:20, 1389:6, 1389:7, 1339:21, 1339:25, 1431:25, 1439:6, 1326:18, 1344:14, 1451:18, 1452:18, 1417:9 1360:25, 1361:4, 1439:7, 1439:8, 1352:7, 1354:13, 1454:7, 1456:10, characterization [1] -1442:15, 1466:16, 1439:17, 1439:22, 1383:14, 1389:18, 1457:11, 1458:7, 1354:10 1466:20, 1466:24, 1440:6, 1440:16, 1419:24. 1436:9. 1459:15, 1463:14, characterize[1] -1467:4, 1467:11, 1440:17, 1440:18, 1441:4. 1445:17. 1560:22, 1560:23, 1518:12 1467:14, 1468:9, 1446:20, 1463:19, 1448:13. 1460:9 1560:24 characters [8] -1468:17, 1469:1, 1466:9, 1466:15, certainly [7] -1382:8, 1383:11, 1469:14, 1470:20, 1466:17, 1467:7, 1374:14, 1418:10, C 1383:24, 1397:18, 1471:14, 1473:16, 1472:16, 1472:21, 1423:2, 1440:10, 1473:22, 1474:1, 1473:23, 1476:1, 1398:8, 1398:9, 1496:8, 1558:6, calendar [1] - 1355:15 1477:11, 1484:24, 1476:21, 1479:12, 1416:25 1558:16 CALL[1] - 1391:12 1494:16, 1499:9, 1481:9, 1492:3, charge [2] - 1470:12, certainty [1] - 1370:17 campaign [1] -1521:16, 1544:15, 1492:14, 1494:5, 1493:5 certify [1] - 1559:6 1315:12 1544:18, 1549:4, 1496:2, 1499:16, charges [1] - 1555:21 cetera [1] - 1295:6 campaigns [2] -1551:25, 1552:13, 1500:16, 1501:19, chart [4] - 1292:21, chain [3] - 1368:21, 1315:9, 1315:10 1502:11, 1504:13, 1487:23, 1490:19, 1552:21, 1552:22, 1369:14, 1446:20 candidly [1] - 1439:16 1553:3, 1553:8, 1505:3, 1507:6, 1498:6 change [29] - 1293:4, cannot [13] - 1327:8, 1507:7, 1508:18, 1553:21, 1553:22 check[11] - 1326:10, 1293:13, 1327:16, 1331:2, 1337:18, 1511:24, 1524:6, Business [4] - 1493:4. 1374:22. 1401:25. 1354:20, 1356:12, 1483:5, 1497:24, 1493:19, 1493:21, 1525:10, 1528:20, 1415:6, 1424:21, 1360:16, 1362:1, 1511:10, 1511:15, 1496:10 1537:5, 1543:2, 1426:3, 1426:5, 1366:13, 1367:9,

1429:16, 1518:3,	City 1921 1350:12	1358:21, 1366:7,	1362:7, 1371:21,	1301:17, 1302:4,
1538:22, 1538:23	City [83] - 1359:12,	1367:14, 1371:19,	1373:10, 1422:5,	1301:17, 1302:4,
· ·	1359:14, 1359:16,		, ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
checked [1] - 1413:13	1359:18, 1361:13,	1385:14, 1399:14,	1422:24, 1423:5,	1304:7, 1305:13,
checking [2] -	1361:19, 1361:22,	1421:11, 1450:2,	1424:4, 1446:17,	1306:2, 1306:13,
1531:19	1361:25, 1362:13,	1468:24, 1469:7,	1448:4, 1449:25,	1306:20, 1307:3,
Children's [1] -	1364:21, 1365:15,	1469:19, 1475:24,	1450:3, 1494:18,	1307:5, 1307:8,
1354:25	1366:2, 1366:5,	1478:24, 1484:16,	1500:24, 1503:18,	1307:20, 1307:21,
<b>choice</b> [17] - 1395:3,	1366:22, 1368:3,	1489:20, 1502:1,	1504:2, 1510:21,	1307:23, 1309:11,
1397:13, 1397:14,	1370:12, 1370:19,	1502:9, 1510:9,	1512:1, 1515:22,	1309:16, 1310:17,
1398:6, 1398:10,	1370:23, 1411:3,	1519:4, 1523:20,	1524:12, 1525:25,	1310:25, 1311:5,
1400:25, 1402:3,	1411:6, 1444:22,	1523:23, 1532:9,	1526:7, 1526:9,	1311:15, 1319:23,
1420:24, 1421:1,	1445:14, 1445:15,	1538:18, 1544:13,	1526:10, 1526:11,	1332:8, 1332:23,
1421:2, 1421:9,	1446:8, 1446:25,	1549:8	1532:3, 1534:24,	1346:19, 1346:22,
1421:12, 1421:14,	1447:4, 1447:7,	clearly [7] - 1305:16,	1535:9, 1542:20	1346:25, 1347:3,
1421:18, 1421:19,	1447:15, 1448:1,	1319:22, 1372:18,	client-sent [1] -	1347:10, 1440:24,
1421:20	1448:17, 1449:8,	1379:23, 1443:12,	1538:11	1442:1, 1442:5,
<b>choose</b> [4] - 1385:9,	1449:23, 1468:1,	1446:20, 1537:2	clients [81] - 1294:18,	1467:20, 1467:21,
1416:6, 1419:10,	1476:7, 1476:10,	CLERK [3] - 1393:24,	1298:19, 1315:6,	1471:2, 1471:3,
1513:10	1476:11, 1476:14,	1554:15, 1554:17	1315:17, 1315:19,	1474:4, 1474:19,
chooses [2] - 1419:2,	1476:17, 1476:18,	Clerk [3] - 1554:13,	1320:21, 1322:7,	1475:5, 1482:7,
1444:12	1490:20, 1491:1,	1554:20, 1555:1	1323:5, 1324:3,	1483:6, 1483:8,
choosing [2] - 1416:9,	1491:2, 1491:11,	clerk [1] - 1313:9	1324:12, 1324:13,	1483:12, 1483:13,
1416:20	1491:13, 1492:21,	click [1] - 1295:18	1328:16, 1335:15,	1484:2, 1484:5,
	1493:8, 1493:14,	client [69] - 1299:25,	1337:18, 1353:2,	1485:16, 1528:25,
<b>chose</b> [8] - 1379:6,	1493:16, 1494:24,		1353:11, 1353:13,	1529:5, 1529:10,
1394:16, 1395:5,	1495:14, 1495:17,	1313:2, 1326:21,	1353:19, 1359:8,	1529:19, 1533:15,
1397:10, 1419:18,	1495:21, 1495:25,	1327:17, 1327:22,	1359:12, 1362:8,	1533:22, 1546:3,
1420:2, 1437:21,	1496:3, 1513:25,	1329:17, 1355:8,	1362:12, 1365:11,	1546:12
1444:13		1358:8, 1358:17,		closely [1] - 1412:6
<b>chosen</b> [5] - 1394:8,	1514:1, 1514:2,	1360:22, 1362:16,	1365:17, 1365:19,	•
1394:15, 1394:16,	1514:6, 1514:9,	1362:17, 1364:2,	1434:9, 1434:10,	closing [6] - 1465:20,
1397:3, 1399:19	1514:11, 1514:15,	1364:3, 1366:22,	1434:18, 1443:20,	1500:20, 1536:4,
chronologically [1] -	1514:18, 1515:1,	1367:4, 1367:16,	1443:24, 1467:25,	1540:11, 1544:6,
1490:17	1515:4, 1515:14,	1367:21, 1368:4,	1468:6, 1475:14,	1554:9
CIO [1] - 1325:13	1517:4, 1517:9,	1368:24, 1369:10,	1476:4, 1476:5,	CLOSING [3] -
CIOs [1] - 1298:7	1519:22, 1519:23,	1370:21, 1370:25,	1478:16, 1479:17,	1560:22, 1560:23,
circuit [1] - 1472:9	1519:24, 1519:25,	1371:20, 1448:25,	1487:16, 1488:2,	1560:24
Circuit [15] - 1472:10,	1520:4, 1521:20,	1450:4, 1450:21,	1493:1, 1496:15,	closings [2] -
1482:4, 1497:14,	1527:13, 1527:14,	1468:4, 1468:8,	1498:17, 1498:21,	1403:19, 1403:21
1506:10, 1507:14,	1549:15, 1549:17,	1475:14, 1476:3,	1499:12, 1499:14,	<b>cmpay</b> [1] - 1501:3
1510:1, 1528:23,	1550:18, 1550:21,	1477:2, 1487:6,	1504:1, 1504:16,	<b>co</b> [2] - 1338:14,
1529:1, 1529:14,	1550:22, 1551:2	1487:10, 1490:23,	1505:2, 1505:4,	1340:2
1533:13, 1533:25,	<b>civil</b> [2] - 1555:23,	1490:24, 1490:25,	1505:6, 1505:7,	<b>Co</b> [1] - 1540:13
1537:24, 1538:4,	1556:5	1491:4, 1491:7,	1514:5, 1514:21,	Co-Analyzer [1] -
1545:21, 1545:22	claim [1] - 1432:17	1494:22, 1498:2,	1514:24, 1515:1,	1540:13
circulated [1] - 1490:1	<b>claimed</b> [6] - 1376:16,	1499:11, 1499:14,	1515:8, 1515:21,	co-sale [2] - 1338:14,
circumstance [1] -	1376:18, 1430:4,	1500:24, 1504:12,	1516:1, 1516:5,	1340:2
1558:14	1508:19, 1538:18,	1510:14, 1510:15,	1516:6, 1516:8,	Cobol [1] - 1383:9
circumstances [3] -	1540:10	1510:17, 1510:18,	1520:1, 1520:6,	COBOL [21] - 1383:23,
1450:19, 1490:1,	claiming [1] - 1538:21	1512:6, 1515:16,	1521:6, 1521:10,	1383:24, 1384:1,
	claims [3] - 1462:21,	1516:5, 1516:14,	1521:14, 1521:15,	1384:20, 1385:8,
1558:11 citation [2] - 1427:6,	1473:5, 1519:6	1516:15, 1516:21,	1521:17, 1521:21,	1386:8, 1387:3,
• •	<b>clarify</b> [2] - 1311:15,	1520:16, 1524:17,	1521:23, 1525:23,	1387:24, 1390:7,
1427:7	1546:6	1525:22, 1526:8,	1525:24, 1530:6,	1390:11, 1390:14,
cite [5] - 1379:5,	clarity [1] - 1387:11	1536:5, 1538:11,	1541:6, 1549:8,	1390:11, 1390:14,
1407:4, 1425:23,	classes [2] - 1479:6,	1540:21, 1549:10,	1549:17, 1551:16,	1394:11, 1396:3,
1426:3, 1428:12	1479:11	1551:16, 1551:18,	1551:19	1400:17, 1419:20,
cited [2] - 1425:4,	classic [1] - 1446:7	1552:25	clients' [1] - 1554:6	1400.17, 1419.20, 1421:16, 1454:24,
1514:11	clean [1] - 1347:25	client's [33] - 1329:17,	close [2] - 1348:1,	1421.10, 1454.24, 1455:17, 1457:22
cites [3] - 1426:13,		1353:22, 1358:10,	1440:2	
1428:18	cleaner [1] - 1383:7	1358:12, 1358:17,	closed [57] - 1301:7,	<b>code</b> [341] - 1291:22,
citing [1] - 1377:19	<b>clear</b> [26] - 1358:11,	1000.12, 1000.17,		1291:23, 1292:17,

-				
1292:24, 1293:5,	1345:12, 1346:5,	1501:12, 1507:3,	1385:4, 1385:9,	1385:1, 1386:7,
1294:20, 1295:3,	1346:7, 1346:9,	1510:8, 1510:9,	1385:11, 1387:5,	1386:16, 1386:20,
1295:9, 1295:10,	1346:12, 1346:19,	1510:12, 1511:23,	1387:9, 1396:3,	1387:1, 1453:25
1295:14, 1295:18,	1347:1, 1347:10,	1510:12, 1511:25, 1511:25, 1512:2,	1396:4, 1430:18,	companies [8] -
1295:19, 1295:22,	1347:14, 1352:23,	1513:20, 1519:16,	1430:19, 1436:12,	1297:2, 1297:4,
	1373:5, 1373:8,	1513.20, 1519.10,	1504:20, 1541:7,	, ,
1295:24, 1296:12,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1297:9, 1310:24,
1296:15, 1296:19,	1373:18, 1377:8,	1525:7, 1528:1,	1541:8, 1541:9,	1316:20, 1337:25,
1298:17, 1298:23,	1377:18, 1377:22,	1528:3, 1528:25,	1541:10	1338:22, 1339:1
1299:5, 1299:13,	1378:1, 1378:9,	1529:9, 1529:10,	column-driven [1] -	company [14] -
1299:24, 1300:8,	1379:24, 1380:1,	1529:11, 1529:19,	1383:10	1297:14, 1315:12,
1300:11, 1300:14,	1380:15, 1382:2,	1530:20, 1530:21,	columns [12] - 1380:1,	1328:10, 1338:4,
1300:20, 1300:23,	1382:3, 1382:19,	1530:22, 1530:24,	1383:13, 1383:15,	1468:10, 1469:21,
1301:2, 1301:7,	1387:8, 1388:24,	1531:5, 1531:9,	1384:3, 1384:12,	1470:22, 1471:13,
1301:16, 1301:17,	1389:19, 1391:12,	1531:20, 1531:23,	1386:8, 1387:8,	1471:21, 1471:23,
1302:4, 1302:6,	1393:7, 1393:13,	1531:24, 1532:3,	1387:13, 1387:14,	1472:11, 1484:24,
1302:7, 1302:12,	1393:18, 1394:8,	1532:7, 1532:14,	1387:15, 1430:14,	1485:2, 1552:11
1302:25, 1304:7,	1394:15, 1395:5,	1533:15, 1533:18,	1453:24	company's [1] -
1305:13, 1306:2,	1395:23, 1396:13,	1533:19, 1534:2,	combination [1] -	1292:19
1306:8, 1306:10,	1396:19, 1397:6,	1534:7, 1534:17,	1397:18	comparative [1] -
1306:13, 1306:20,	1397:7, 1398:19,	1534:18, 1534:21,	coming [10] - 1305:3,	1303:3
1307:3, 1307:5,	1406:15, 1407:6,	1534:23, 1534:24,	1309:1, 1310:10,	comparatively [1] -
1307:6, 1307:8,	1407:7, 1407:10,	1535:5, 1535:7,	1310:22, 1311:20,	1367:10
1307:12, 1307:13,	1407:11, 1407:18,	1535:9, 1535:13,	1312:21, 1318:7,	compare [3] -
1307:15, 1307:17,	1407:20, 1416:17,	1535:21, 1535:24,	1320:7, 1320:23,	1375:18, 1477:18,
1307:18, 1307:19,	1416:22, 1417:10,	1538:23, 1542:20,	1456:5	1509:4
1307:20, 1307:21,	1434:8, 1434:10,	1546:1, 1546:2,	comment [13] -	compared [1] -
1307:23, 1308:5,	1439:21, 1441:8,	1546:3, 1546:4,	1335:22, 1380:8,	1379:16
1308:15, 1309:11,	1441:15, 1441:20,	1546:12, 1546:18,	1380:9, 1381:11,	comparing [2] -
1309:17, 1309:20,	1442:2, 1442:5,	1546:24, 1547:1,	1381:13, 1382:4,	1370:20, 1379:19
1310:6, 1310:17,	1448:16, 1448:25,	1547:2, 1547:7,	1383:13, 1395:25,	comparison [5] -
1310:18, 1311:2,	1449:7, 1449:9,	1547:8, 1548:4,	1396:2, 1396:3,	1388:2, 1392:14,
1311:5, 1311:15,	1449:14, 1450:13,	1548:5, 1552:7,	1396:8, 1397:7,	1393:8, 1393:18,
1311:16, 1312:12,	1450:14, 1450:18,	1553:1	1397:8	1456:7
1312:17, 1313:16,	1450:19, 1456:12,	coded [6] - 1292:23,	comments [3] -	
1314:9, 1314:20,	1457:13, 1457:16,	1293:11, 1336:5,	1382:5, 1382:6,	comparisons [6] -
1314:22, 1315:23,	1460:25, 1461:5,	1394:8, 1394:15,	1499:25	1452:20, 1507:3,
1317:17, 1319:6,	1461:17, 1461:22,	1418:11	commit [1] - 1545:17	1507:4, 1507:5,
1319:7, 1319:8,	1461:23, 1462:15,	codes [1] - 1487:6	committed [1] -	1507:9, 1508:16
1319:16, 1319:18,	1463:3, 1467:16,	coding [3] - 1314:18,	1471:15	<b>compete</b> [1] - 1553:15
1319:21, 1319:23,	1467:21, 1467:22,	1378:11, 1378:15	-	competency [1] -
1322:4, 1322:5,	1471:3, 1474:4,	COE [2] - 1444:22,	common [12] -	1516:2
1322:15, 1322:17,	1474:19, 1475:6,	1445:14	1296:20, 1311:1,	competes [1] - 1467:4
1323:19, 1324:16,	1476:2, 1476:24,	coin [1] - 1307:17	1375:6, 1378:11,	competition [2] -
1324:20, 1324:23,	1477:3, 1477:10,	coincidence [1] -	1385:16, 1394:10,	1467:1, 1467:2
1325:3, 1326:4,	1480:14, 1480:18,	1382:12	1406:25, 1415:21,	competitor [2] -
1326:9, 1328:25,	1481:11, 1481:12,		1456:2, 1456:24,	1336:9, 1543:9
1329:7, 1329:23,	1482:1, 1482:7,	colleague [7] -	1512:18, 1558:3	competitors [1] -
1330:1, 1330:21,	1482:11, 1482:18,	1426:7, 1429:17,	commonly [1] -	1297:5
1331:1, 1331:2,	1482:24, 1482:25,	1448:7, 1489:12,	1457:3	<b>compile</b> [2] - 1307:17,
1331:9, 1332:2,	1483:5, 1483:6,	1517:5, 1517:6,	communicate [2] -	1407:6
1332:5, 1332:6,	1483:7, 1483:8,	1518:2	1367:20, 1448:7	<b>compiled</b> [9] - 1307:5,
1332:8, 1332:10,	1483:9, 1483:12,	colleagues [1] -	communicated [1] -	1307:20, 1307:21,
1332:0, 1332:10,	1483:13, 1483:14,	1424:22	1370:18	1332:14, 1407:7,
1332:11, 1332:12,	1484:2, 1484:5,	collecting [2] -	communication [1] -	1407:11, 1512:2,
1332:23, 1332:24,	1484:6, 1484:8,	1373:5, 1373:18	1382:1	1512:7, 1524:18
1332:23, 1332:24,	1484:12, 1485:19,	<b>column</b> [26] - 1380:11,	communications [4] -	compiling [2] -
1333:19, 1333:23,	1485:20, 1486:8,	1383:10, 1383:17,	1302:24, 1361:10,	1511:23, 1546:18
1334:4, 1336:13,	1486:14, 1486:17,	1383:20, 1384:6,	1434:11, 1441:4	complained [2] -
1334.4, 1330.13,	1486:20, 1487:12,	1384:10, 1384:14,	commuter [1] -	1379:8, 1379:12
1342:17, 1344:21,	1487:14, 1499:3,	1384:24, 1384:25,	1327:23	complaining [1] -
1342:17, 1344:21, 1344:25, 1345:7,	1499:4, 1501:7,	1385:2, 1385:3,	<b>comp</b> [7] <b>-</b> 1384:10,	1549:18
1077.20, 1040.1,	1700.7, 1001.7,			

complete [5] -1403:19, 1477:14, 1542:3, 1558:25 completed [3] -1410:13, 1411:3, 1411:5 completely [8] -1326:13, 1397:15, 1398:6. 1399:14. 1400:25, 1402:16, 1429:20, 1509:5 complex [3] -1295:21, 1525:7, 1556:5 compliance [14] -1436:17, 1471:11, 1473:25, 1475:3, 1477:13, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1501:23, 1505:1, 1540:9, 1543:25, 1544:21, 1551:22, 1552:18 compliant [3] -1497:23, 1497:24, 1510:16 complications [1] -1555:19 complied [2] -1471:19, 1502:16 complimented [1] -1468:21 comply [8] - 1468:22, 1469:9, 1469:16, 1470:5, 1470:15, 1486:15, 1541:2, 1553:13 complying [1] -1502:24 component [2] -1406:25, 1411:11 components [2] -1528:14, 1529:20 computer [14] -1327:18. 1331:23. 1331:25. 1363:15. 1409:23, 1416:6, 1416:10, 1422:14, 1422:15, 1458:25, 1459:7, 1479:6, 1479:10, 1548:19 conceded [1] -1474:22 conceivable [1] -1298:21 concept [1] - 1328:23 concepts [4] -1309:14, 1309:17, 1346:25, 1347:5 concern [1] - 1359:2 concerned [3] -

1435:8, 1555:7, 1559:1 concerning [1] -1319:24 concerns [2] -1534:14. 1543:17 conclude [7] - 1299:8, 1299:10, 1301:1, 1322:24, 1323:3, 1347:21, 1543:18 concluded [4] -1322:2, 1495:9, 1530:18, 1531:13 conclusion [3] -1345:16, 1388:25, 1502:8 conclusions [8] -1309:2, 1311:21, 1312:21, 1318:8, 1320:8, 1356:10, 1554:12, 1558:17 concrete [1] - 1445:9 conditions [1] -1556:2 conduct [22] - 1345:9, 1345:25, 1379:9, 1379:12, 1468:25, 1469:2, 1472:13, 1473:8, 1474:13, 1474:15, 1474:17, 1475:25, 1483:20, 1503:15, 1526:16, 1531:5, 1532:10, 1535:22, 1538:12, 1541:3, 1552:8, 1553:16 conducted [3] -1320:12, 1337:3, 1443:13 conducting [3] -1292:8, 1380:13, 1382:22 confident [2] -1427:25, 1428:3 configuration [4] -1319:9, 1319:18, 1322:6, 1370:21 confirm [2] - 1374:10, 1374:14 confirmation [2] -1357:2, 1371:15 confirmed [5] -1446:9, 1451:23, 1516:17, 1547:18, 1547:20 conflate [1] - 1358:16 conflating [1] - 1508:2 conflict [2] - 1440:24, 1519:1

conflicting [1] -

1495:5 conflicts [1] - 1557:25 conforming [1] -1393:2 confronted [1] -1548:2 confused [2] -1387:22, 1483:22 confusion [1] - 1510:7 Congress [2] -1316:9, 1316:12 connect [1] - 1328:15 connected [1] -1476:23 connection [6] -1296:10, 1298:11, 1311:20, 1364:13, 1434:21, 1475:21 consensus [1] -1404:9 consequences [1] -1512:14 consider [8] -1353:18, 1380:25, 1400:7, 1402:6, 1421:7, 1443:14, 1463:3, 1507:13 considerable [1] -1455:15 considerably [1] -1438:1 consideration [1] -1385:12 considered [6] -1304:15, 1327:2, 1381:1, 1382:11, 1390:18, 1548:4 consistent [11] -1382:8, 1392:4, 1392:6, 1395:14, 1410:22, 1484:11, 1484:12, 1497:5, 1529:10, 1543:22 consistently [3] -1384:13, 1392:3, 1503:20 consists [1] - 1544:24 constitute [1] -1370:14 constitutes [1] -1473:8 constitutional [1] -1543:17 constrained [19] -1377:8, 1377:18, 1377:22, 1378:1, 1378:9, 1390:18, 1391:24, 1392:3, 1396:1, 1396:6, 1396:9, 1400:25,

1402:2, 1460:13, 1460:14, 1460:17, 1461:10, 1497:2 constrains [1] -1394:24 constraint [6] -1376:8, 1383:7, 1385:8, 1400:8, 1402:17, 1417:11 constraints [4] -1375:25, 1417:10, 1507:13, 1508:22 construed [1] -1529:15 consultant [2] -1501:10, 1515:25 consultants [1] -1531:7 contain [7] - 1308:3, 1309:19, 1321:16, 1325:2, 1394:19, 1432:1, 1529:5 contained [6] -1310:25, 1332:24, 1351:17, 1431:20, 1498:8, 1525:1 containing [2] -1407:9. 1489:4 contains [7] -1394:18, 1417:4, 1418:21, 1524:1, 1524:25, 1525:10, 1529:18 contemplate [1] -1331:6 contemplated [3] -1423:8, 1444:13, 1521:5 contemporaneous [1] - 1514:4 contemporaneously [1] - 1488:13 contempt [13] -1466:13, 1466:18, 1468:24, 1470:22, 1471:22, 1503:4, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1538:12, 1539:3. 1539:21, 1551:21, 1553:24 contemptuous [2] -1468:25, 1544:14 contemptuously [2] -1484:15, 1546:7 contend [7] - 1293:15, 1417:2, 1418:16, 1523:1, 1525:1, 1532:3, 1542:20 contending [6] -1299:22, 1415:18,

1415:23, 1418:7, 1516:19, 1516:23 contends [1] -1460:16 content [11] - 1373:16, 1373:22. 1410:1. 1439:7, 1475:9, 1497:8, 1505:20, 1547:17, 1548:8, 1548:11, 1548:14 contention [7] -1296:10, 1296:14, 1418:8, 1419:8, 1420:8, 1474:1, 1488:10 contentions [2] -1435:18, 1502:5 contents [1] - 1505:24 context [21] - 1309:17, 1366:21, 1378:14, 1395:19, 1405:15, 1407:17, 1408:4, 1409:4, 1416:7, 1416:22, 1418:22, 1418:25, 1421:24, 1432:4, 1442:7, 1442:23, 1461:10, 1504:8, 1529:11, 1536:23, 1536:25 contexts [1] - 1416:1 contextually [1] -1416:16 continuation [1] -1383:13 continue [7] - 1403:6, 1467:12, 1469:2, 1469:14, 1484:12, 1544:17, 1552:22 continued [2] -1478:23 continues [5] -1466:25, 1467:3, 1468:13, 1478:3, 1484:24 continuing [2] -1478:19, 1478:21 contract [4] - 1326:22, 1328:2, 1328:3, 1516:5 contracted [1] -1514:6 contractor [1] -1313:1 contractors [6] -1297:22, 1311:25, 1325:7, 1325:8, 1325:11, 1342:25 contracts [2] -1326:16, 1328:8 contractual [2] -

Cross-examination
[3] - 1560:5, 1560:9,
1560:13
cross-examination [8]
- 1331:15, 1341:1,
1402:22, 1411:14,
1463:7, 1496:18,

CROSS-EXAMINATION[3] -1331:21, 1411:17, 1463:13

1518:11, 1518:20

cross-examinations
[1] - 1404:3
cross-examine [1] -

1439:4

cross-use [50] 1330:17, 1357:19,
1358:23, 1443:17,
1444:16, 1444:21,
1451:11, 1466:17,
1473:8, 1478:1,
1478:19, 1478:22,
1479:25, 1486:20,
1490:20, 1491:19,
1509:21, 1509:23,
1512:19, 1512:20.

1513:16, 1513:17, 1516:20, 1517:12, 1517:19, 1517:24, 1518:8, 1518:12, 1518:16, 1518:23, 1519:5, 1522:14, 1525:20, 1526:1, 1526:5, 1526:13, 1538:15, 1538:19,

1539:2, 1539:9, 1539:10, 1539:17, 1540:2, 1540:5, 1540:6, 1540:7, 1550:25, 1551:4, 1551:13

**crossed** [1] - 1417:20 **crude** [2] - 1316:8, 1316:18

crystal [1] - 1532:9

CTOs [1] - 1298:7 curiosity [1] - 1479:9 current [7] - 1320:18, 1341:24, 1373:11, 1413:2, 1469:22, 1484:11, 1556:1 cursor [20] - 1391:5,

**cursor** [20] - 1391:5, 1395:11, 1395:15, 1401:8, 1401:10, 1402:9, 1402:11, 1402:13, 1416:6, 1416:9, 1416:10, 1458:20, 1458:22, 1458:25, 1459:1, 1459:3, 1459:7

CURSOR [9] - 1395:8,
1395:12, 1395:16,
1401:6, 1401:22,
1402:14, 1458:22,
1460:21, 1462:5

custody [1] - 1555:20

custody [1] - 1555:20 custom [8] - 1315:23, 1319:5, 1319:7, 1319:16, 1322:4, 1322:15, 1530:20, 1533:19

customer [20] 1294:13, 1311:25,
1312:16, 1326:14,
1328:1, 1337:1,
1337:14, 1354:22,
1364:14, 1366:24,
1375:9, 1410:20,
1441:18, 1448:11,
1475:21, 1546:23,

1550:8 Customer [3] -1310:4, 1312:6, 1529:23 customer's [4] -1334:2, 1445:5

1334:2, 1445:5, 1446:4, 1448:10 **customers** [33] -1293:18, 1294:11, 1294:15, 1297:20, 1316:17, 1319:3, 1319:6, 1322:4, 1325:7, 1327:10, 1327:13, 1333:7, 1334:1, 1336:13, 1337:9, 1337:12, 1337:16, 1467:17, 1470:9, 1470:10, 1472:6, 1472:14,

14/2:6, 14/2:14, 1473:20, 1476:15, 1476:18, 1478:11, 1478:18, 1486:3, 1486:25, 1487:5, 1530:21, 1551:12 customization [1] -1375:9 customizations [7] -1306:10, 1315:6,

1315:10, 1316:3, 1316:5, 1316:7, 1317:2 customize [1] -1441:13 cut [3] - 1341:19, 1342:1, 1513:24 cycle [1] - 1291:25 D

D.C [1] - 1292:14 D000-FILE-RECOVERY [1] -1399:12 D000-FILE-

RECOVERY-EXIT [1] - 1399:13 dash [2] - 1400:23, 1456:18

DATA<sub>[11]</sub> - 1417:22, 1418:8, 1418:17, 1419:9, 1420:9, 1421:19, 1421:20, 1459:18, 1460:3, 1460:4, 1507:21

**Data** [9] - 1315:13, 1406:2, 1407:25, 1408:2, 1408:4, 1408:9, 1408:25, 1498:8, 1498:19

data [33] - 1319:9,

1319:19, 1322:6, 1384:20, 1387:16, 1387:21, 1391:5, 1391:6, 1393:20, 1393:21, 1394:16, 1395:2, 1400:12,

1400:13, 1400:15, 1400:17, 1414:7, 1414:10, 1414:13, 1414:15, 1414:17, 1417:23, 1426:16,

1460:5, 1460:6, 1476:11, 1496:3, 1496:4, 1506:21, 1506:23, 1506:24, 1507:1

database [47] 1325:21, 1355:16,
1373:25, 1390:7,
1390:16, 1408:5,
1408:6, 1408:7,
1408:8, 1409:17,
1409:25, 1414:11,
1414:14, 1414:19,
1431:12, 1431:23,
1432:1, 1432:6,

1432:1, 1432:6, 1432:8, 1432:10, 1432:22, 1457:3, 1459:3, 1459:4, 1459:5, 1506:5, 1506:8, 1506:12, 1506:22, 1536:6, 1536:8, 1536:12, 1536:24, 1537:3, 1537:9, 1537:11, 1538:6, 1538:23.

1542:6, 1542:7,

1542:10, 1542:14, 1542:17, 1547:12, 1547:14, 1547:16 **date** [18] - 1356:12, 1357:4, 1357:13, 1366:5, 1374:13, 1374:15, 1394:10, 1416:20, 1417:16, 1465:15, 1532:17, 1554:14, 1554:19, 1555:6, 1556:4, 1557:20

dated [1] - 1342:7 dates [5] - 1357:11, 1405:16, 1556:6, 1556:25, 1558:7 dating [1] - 1491:14 Davenport [2] -

1500:12, 1520:11 **Davenport's** [1] -1375:2

days [12] - 1354:19, 1367:16, 1368:21, 1370:8, 1383:23, 1397:24, 1426:6, 1464:23, 1496:8, 1511:19, 1533:17, 1540:23 DDX-202 [1] - 1444:18

DDX-512 [1] - 1376:6 DDX-538 [1] - 1386:3 DDX-559 [1] - 1360:2 DDX-708 [1] - 1292:2 DDX-709 [1] - 1314:4 DDX-711 [1] - 1323:12 DDX-724 [1] - 1320:2 de [7] - 1415:13, 1427:14, 1427:16,

1427:19, 1429:16, 1463:4, 1535:17 **de-duplicated** [4] -1427:14, 1427:16, 1427:19, 1429:16 **deadline** [1] - 1554:14 **deal** [3] - 1401:2,

1452:5, 1509:8 **dealing** [2] - 1342:21, 1558:10 **dealt** [3] - 1438:23,

1513:23, 1517:7 **debate** [2] - 1547:24, 1547:25 **Deborah** [2] - 1320:4,

1531:11 **decade** [2] - 1451:2, 1536:25

**decades** [3] - 1298:1, 1501:11, 1532:21 **December** [1] - 1533:8

**decide** [1] - 1533

defer [1] - 1332:4 define [1] - 1419:5 defined [5] - 1370:16,

1387:16, 1423:16, 1423:23, 1478:20 **definitely** [1] -

1555:24

disagreements [1] -1372:10, 1436:10, **DISTRICT** [3] - 1290:1, 1356:7, 1356:13, 1454:5, 1457:10, 1290:1, 1290:2 1356:15, 1424:10, 1453:13 1538:23 1458:19, 1522:12, 1425:14, 1425:18, disassemble [2] displayed [1] -District [2] - 1471:7, 1547:23, 1557:7 1307:23, 1310:5 1299:24 1484:14 1428:12, 1429:2, downstream [1] disassembling [3] displaying [5] ditched [1] - 1384:15 1440:9, 1441:2, 1398:3 1308:4, 1309:20, 1299:13, 1300:7, dive [1] - 1512:19 1442:12, 1442:25, dozens [1] - 1525:6 1300:14. 1300:23. 1488:19, 1489:3, 1529:12 **DMS**[10] - 1404:19, Dr [3] - 1385:2, 1490:11, 1490:14, 1531:19 1389:25, 1401:24 disaster [1] - 1486:15 1405:19, 1406:2, 1494:6, 1494:8, dispositive [1] disavow [1] - 1521:25 1406:3, 1407:25, drafts [1] - 1438:14 1378:13 1495:5, 1499:1, discharge [1] - 1544:1 1408:11, 1408:16, dramatic [1] - 1466:19 1505:23, 1520:5, dispositively [1] discipline [5] -1410:9, 1410:23, draw [2] - 1302:3, 1521:4, 1521:19, 1413:17 1488:17, 1502:19, 1411:11 1522:10 1523:6, 1526:22, 1541:13, 1545:11, disprove [1] - 1442:13 doc [1] - 1521:13 drawing [2] - 1393:9, 1528:19, 1549:14, 1545:14 disproves [1] - 1533:4 docket [1] - 1330:10 1406:21 1553:1 dispute [5] - 1383:5, drew [2] - 1400:10, disciplined [2] -Document [2] dollars [1] - 1540:20 1385:6, 1490:24, 1489:13, 1505:7 1349:2, 1349:17 1400:21 domain [1] - 1415:13 disclose [1] - 1536:7 1492:10, 1510:18 document [33] drilling [2] - 1316:10, **Don** [11] - 1359:17, disclosed [1] - 1536:9 disputed [3] - 1504:9, 1300:22, 1303:23, 1316:20 1361:11, 1445:10, 1534:22, 1535:25 1304:2, 1304:14, driven [1] - 1383:10 discover [2] - 1310:6, 1445:13, 1446:24, disputing [1] -1305:1, 1319:11, **Drop** [1] - 1508:18 1382:21 1493:9, 1514:24, 1528:10 1340:7, 1340:16, discovery [4] -**DSI**[3] - 1315:13, 1340:24, 1342:1, 1517:2, 1517:3, dissection [24] -1488:10, 1490:13, 1315:22 1342:6, 1352:18, 1517:25, 1521:14 1376:9, 1376:21, 1543:6, 1543:7 DTX-46 [2] - 1349:4, done [43] - 1305:4, 1355:8, 1368:22, 1377:20, 1379:1, discrete [1] - 1551:25 1349:6 1334:13, 1334:19, 1384:16, 1399:25, 1390:10, 1390:13, DTX-500 [2] - 1392:7, discretion [5] -1334:22, 1335:22, 1400:3, 1460:15, 1392:7, 1395:13, 1397:9, 1397:15, 1460:7 1336:11, 1336:14, 1401:3, 1401:12, 1474:20, 1475:7, 1395:17, 1401:7, DTX-501 [2] - 1454:4, 1358:9, 1360:18, 1401:9, 1410:22, 1442:20 1475:12, 1496:16, 1454:9 1362:13, 1369:10, 1411:1, 1411:2, 1496:18, 1506:17, discretionary [2] -DTX-716 [1] - 1349:14 1383:23, 1387:10, 1506:19, 1507:2, 1451:9, 1460:7, 1398:6, 1398:10 DTX-733 [4] - 1318:11, 1425:1, 1425:3, 1478:14, 1493:9, 1507:12, 1547:24, discuss [5] - 1306:6. 1336:17, 1349:12, 1434:21, 1440:2, 1496:1, 1499:6, 1548:1, 1548:6, 1452:20, 1454:25, 1349:14 1444:4, 1445:25, 1548:15, 1548:16, 1550:17, 1550:20 1468:10, 1558:3 **DTX-740** [1] - 1349:23 1446:2, 1446:12, 1548:20, 1548:22 documentary [1] discussed [15] due [1] - 1463:8 1448:3, 1448:10, 1440:24 distinction [18] -1292:13, 1347:7, duplicated [4] -1449:12, 1450:3, 1301:16, 1301:21, documentation [21] -1355:24, 1358:19, 1427:14, 1427:16, 1450:8, 1451:13, 1302:3, 1302:5, 1294:3, 1312:7, 1360:15, 1362:20, 1427:19, 1429:16 1461:4, 1470:1, 1302:7, 1304:6, 1314:16, 1335:5, 1405:21, 1437:6, during [22] - 1294:6, 1470:25, 1483:20, 1304:13, 1367:3, 1336:16, 1344:15, 1437:8, 1439:2, 1298:14, 1300:17, 1501:11, 1506:18, 1371:6, 1371:19, 1350:24, 1351:3, 1451:24, 1460:2, 1305:11, 1321:18, 1508:12, 1527:7, 1406:21, 1440:25, 1354:23, 1363:8, 1461:20, 1471:2, 1327:2, 1328:9, 1551:16, 1551:20, 1442:2, 1487:10, 1363:14, 1390:3, 1489:1 1376:25, 1388:7, 1551:21, 1553:14, 1522:12, 1533:2, 1422:14, 1475:20, discusses [2] -1439:2, 1439:7, 1553:16, 1554:5, 1533:21, 1533:22 1479:16, 1481:3, 1486:20, 1486:21 1439:8, 1441:3, 1558:3 distinguish [1] -1481:4, 1486:22, discussing [7] -1442:23, 1458:24, dot [1] - 1351:24 1488:14, 1490:9, 1492:14 1372:23, 1379:14, 1471:16, 1478:4, double [5] - 1386:24, 1491:10 distorts [1] - 1538:8 1399:24, 1454:14, 1488:10, 1504:10, 1387:7, 1424:21, documentations [1] distribute [4] -1478:14, 1553:17 1528:5, 1536:3, 1429:16, 1556:8 1362:11, 1444:14, 1487:24 discussion [9] -1558:10 doubt [1] - 1502:6 1475:19, 1537:11 documented [1] -1364:15, 1415:4, down [25] - 1316:12, distributed [5] -1494:11 1436:12, 1436:13, 1320:15, 1355:17, 1405:10, 1448:11, documents [45] -1437:10, 1439:23, 1299:4, 1301:21, 1365:7, 1373:22, 1480:23, 1488:6, e-mail [22] - 1365:7, 1465:14, 1490:4, 1381:25, 1388:4, 1304:12, 1340:23, 1496:14 1497:11 1367:14, 1368:12, 1389:14, 1393:25, 1350:20, 1351:17, distributing [1] -1368:21, 1369:13, Discussion [1] -1401:13, 1401:23, 1351:19, 1351:22, 1308:15 1369:24, 1372:6, 1544:4 1426:16, 1429:9, 1352:6, 1352:8, distribution [1] disobey [1] - 1485:6 1374:14, 1374:15, 1450:13, 1451:6, 1361:17 1352:11, 1353:1, 1405:1, 1405:3, display [8] - 1300:11, 1451:7, 1451:8, distributor [3] -1353:11, 1353:12, 1405:7, 1405:9, 1300:20, 1301:1, 1451:21, 1452:7, 1353:14, 1354:13, 1293:2, 1293:5 1433:24, 1435:15,

1354:15, 1362:25,

Е

1424:4, 1481:25,

1532:18

1337:13, 1338:22,

1345:12, 1346:3,

1471:6, 1546:23

employees [11] -

1447:4, 1447:9,

1448:5, 1448:10,

1507:19

granular [1] - 1506:24 grateful [1] - 1465:11 great [2] - 1295:20, 1401:2 greater [2] - 1293:22, 1358.6 green [2] - 1528:6, 1528:13 Griener [3] - 1290:23, 1559:8, 1559:8 Grigsby [2] - 1470:12, 1471.1 grossly [1] - 1538:8 ground [1] - 1558:3 group [2] - 1359:12, 1360:25 **Group** [1] - 1316:23 grouped [1] - 1357:18 guess [3] - 1392:15, 1402:19, 1455:24 Guest [1] - 1438:16 guidance [9] - 1415:7, 1465:14, 1468:14, 1471:7, 1484:13, 1484:22, 1492:2, 1540:19, 1540:20 guy [2] - 1450:6, 1450:25 **guys** [1] - 1306:8

## Н

habitual [1] - 1382:16 hah [1] - 1446:7 haiku [2] - 1417:18, 1417:20 half [3] - 1409:4, 1501:2, 1556:9 halfway [1] - 1326:10 halted [1] - 1478:22 hand [7] - 1366:19, 1388:8, 1389:20, 1392:19, 1450:5, 1495:12, 1508:5 handed [2] - 1400:6, 1555:2 handful [1] - 1297:19 handle [1] - 1316:18 handling [1] - 1496:2 hands [1] - 1325:25 hang [1] - 1433:5 happy [4] - 1402:19, 1404:5, 1555:3, 1555:9 hard [4] - 1302:20, 1554:3, 1557:4, 1558:8 hardware [1] -1341:12 HCL [2] - 1297:10,

1338:1 heavily [1] - 1479:1 HCM [1] - 1372:4 heavy [4] - 1400:6, HCM200049 [6] -1501:19, 1502:2, 1359:7, 1359:17, 1538:9 1361:20, 1361:23, heavy-handed [1] -1374:10, 1374:17 1400:6 heightened [1] -HCR [1] - 1369:10 1543:16 head [6] - 1446:16, 1447:19, 1493:19, held [21] - 1443:18, 1443:25, 1444:3, 1500:9, 1500:11, 1500:14 1476:1, 1482:13, headers [2] - 1430:17, 1483:21, 1487:7, 1541:11 1487:21, 1495:20, heads [1] - 1404:8 1512:23, 1527:12, Health [1] - 1355:12 1527:24, 1528:23, hear [8] - 1308:2, 1533:13, 1533:25, 1539:3, 1539:21, 1364:21, 1459:23, 1544:4, 1550:1, 1460:20, 1500:6, 1501:5, 1552:1, 1552:9, 1555:20 hell [1] - 1325:18 1556:18 help [11] - 1354:21, heard [40] - 1301:16, 1302:11, 1304:10, 1370:24, 1397:18, 1327:1, 1337:23, 1420:2, 1449:4, 1479:12, 1549:16, 1349:13, 1355:23, 1549:17, 1550:22, 1361:18, 1371:8, 1383:9, 1404:17, 1550:23, 1553:19 1406:5, 1422:19, helping [1] - 1340:2 herring [1] - 1524:20 1433:11, 1433:15, 1433:17, 1456:22, herself [3] - 1505:16, 1459:16, 1459:24, 1506:4, 1518:10 1460:19, 1484:21, hesitant [1] - 1556:3 1485:14, 1485:21, Hi [1] - 1372:3 1485:22, 1486:3, HICKS [1] - 1290:2 1487:1, 1492:11, high [2] - 1293:14, 1495:13, 1503:5, 1303:7 1504:9, 1505:9, higher [1] - 1486:10 1512:13, 1520:10, highlighted [8] -1520:20, 1529:7, 1374:4, 1388:1, 1531:8, 1532:21, 1402:7, 1460:9, 1543:1, 1546:10, 1460:11, 1460:17, 1547:25 1462:9, 1462:20 HEARING [1] highlighting [4] -1290:11 1354:12, 1381:14, hearing [22] - 1296:1, 1401:4, 1462:4 1301:4, 1302:16, highly [3] - 1442:10, 1372:6, 1372:10, 1443:3, 1502:5 1380:4, 1403:19, Hill [2] - 1290:17, 1466:17, 1466:22, 1560:5 1471:22, 1478:4, hill [3] - 1331:20, 1496:20, 1500:4, 1340:9, 1348:4 1504:5, 1504:14, HILL [30] - 1293:21, 1504:15, 1506:19, 1298:25, 1303:23, 1537:7, 1552:21, 1324:4, 1331:16, 1553:2, 1553:22, 1331:19, 1331:22, 1554:11 1334:17, 1334:18, hearings [1] - 1442:6 1335:10, 1335:12, hearsay [1] - 1298:25 1336:17, 1336:19,

heart's [4] - 1475:9,

1497:8, 1548:7,

1548:14

1342:3, 1342:4, 1343:21, 1343:22, 1345:3, 1345:5, 1345:20, 1345:21, 1346:13, 1347:19, 1348:6 HILL1 [1] - 1305:20 hip [1] - 1445:7 hire [2] - 1297:22, 1324:14 hired [3] - 1300:7, 1344:8, 1479:15 **history** [12] - 1301:5, 1356:6, 1467:2, 1472:17, 1478:8, 1487:14, 1487:17, 1537:2, 1540:14, 1540:16, 1552:12, 1558:10 hit [2] - 1509:24, 1512:19 Hmm [1] - 1326:6 hold [4] - 1326:7, 1418:14, 1423:19, 1555:13 holder's [1] - 1415:11 **holding** [1] - 1316:2 Home [5] - 1524:22, 1525:15, 1525:16, 1551:9, 1551:10 honestly [1] - 1449:19 Honor [78] - 1291:13, 1293:21, 1303:23, 1304:2, 1304:25, 1331:16, 1340:16, 1340:17, 1340:22, 1341:2, 1342:3, 1345:20, 1346:13, 1346:15, 1347:17, 1347:19, 1347:24, 1348:17, 1349:3, 1349:20, 1350:5, 1350:10, 1402:18, 1403:10, 1404:1, 1404:13, 1411:15, 1412:2, 1435:2, 1435:4, 1435:17, 1438:19, 1438:22, 1439:12, 1439:25, 1440:14, 1440:15, 1452:1, 1452:3, 1452:12, 1464:1, 1464:5, 1464:15, 1465:1, 1466:7, 1499:22, 1499:24, 1500:8, 1500:10, 1500:13, 1503:14, 1503:20, 1503:23, 1504:22, 1505:11, 1512:21, 1512:23,

**-**2.0 1513:9, 1516:19, 1517:17, 1522:13, 1529:7, 1529:15, 1532:9, 1536:21, 1536:22, 1537:1, 1541:1, 1542:1, 1543:12, 1543:18, 1544:1, 1555:4, 1556:20, 1557:11, 1558:22, 1558:23 Honor's [11] - 1351:9, 1440:3, 1500:22, 1505:11, 1522:13, 1522:17, 1529:14, 1540:18, 1541:3, 1543:20 HONORABLE [1] -1290:2 hope [1] - 1525:23 hopefully [2] - 1557:2, 1557:14 Hospital [1] - 1354:25 host [2] - 1503:24, 1504:3 hosting [27] - 1422:3, 1422:4, 1422:5, 1422:10. 1422:17. 1422:19, 1422:23, 1422:24, 1423:4, 1423:5, 1424:1, 1424:3, 1424:4, 1424:5, 1435:6, 1438:24, 1439:14, 1503:12, 1503:14, 1503:15, 1503:18, 1506:8, 1506:11, 1537:20, 1538:2, 1538:5, 1538:24 hotel [1] - 1326:10 Houmand [1] -1290:16 hour [5] - 1465:20, 1496:9, 1496:10, 1544:10, 1551:7 housecleaning [1] -1465:2 housekeeping [3] -1347:25, 1348:18, 1403:11 HTML [4] - 1352:13, 1436:10, 1438:1, 1438:6 human [10] - 1332:6, 1332:10, 1332:12, 1332:15, 1483:7, 1485:19, 1528:13, 1528:16, 1546:3 human-readable [10] -1332:6, 1332:10, 1332:12, 1332:15,

1340:4, 1340:11,

1340:17, 1341:1,

1341:5, 1341:6,

1483:7, 1485:19, 1528:13, 1528:16, 1546:3 humanly [1] - 1483:8 hundred [2] - 1389:16, 1409:20 hundreds [3] -1454:23, 1455:17, 1457:22 hypothetical [6] -1365:19, 1447:6, 1447:10, 1447:14, 1449:3, 1450:16 hypotheticals [1] -1448:20

ı

i.e [1] - 1313:4 IBM [7] - 1297:9, 1411:20, 1412:13, 1413:6, 1413:8, 1413:9, 1511:14 identical [2] -1392:11, 1417:8 identification [1] -1340:21 identified [10] -1347:11, 1397:21, 1425:18, 1428:11, 1488:11, 1488:19, 1495:20, 1504:17, 1541:1, 1551:1 identifiers [1] - 1437:2 identifies [2] -1375:25, 1388:19 identify [9] - 1337:9, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1355:9, 1378:5, 1392:12, 1417:12, 1545:14, 1551:3 identifying [2] -1378:20, 1390:17 **IDs** [1] - 1333:14 ignore [2] - 1540:15, 1545:16 ignored [2] - 1400:14, 1492:4 ignores [1] - 1354:5 II [14] - 1375:23, 1376:14, 1376:19, 1377:2, 1377:11, 1377:20, 1405:16, 1465:15, 1491:24, 1512:24, 1524:6, 1524:8, 1550:2, 1555:7 Ilissa [1] - 1290:20 illegal [20] - 1296:14, 1296:19, 1314:24,

1469:2, 1471:12, 1474:13, 1474:15, 1474:17, 1476:1, 1480:18, 1481:24, 1483:21, 1526:15, 1526:16, 1526:17, 1531:5, 1532:18, 1532:19, 1542:5, 1552:9 illuminating [1] -1399:3 illustrate [2] -1358:25, 1371:23 illustrates [2] -1367:24, 1386:17 image [1] - 1294:24 imagine [1] - 1555:18 immediate [2] -1469:24, 1493:18 immediately [2] -1325:13, 1325:19 impact [3] - 1407:14, 1470:2, 1470:20 impacted [1] - 1515:1 implement [2] -1295:23, 1516:4 implementation [3] -1313:2, 1327:14, 1339:7 implementations [1] -1532:22 implemented [4] -1337:1, 1485:24, 1486:2 implementing [1] -1532:22 implications [1] -1517:25 implicitly [1] - 1488:16 implied [1] - 1537:20 imply [3] - 1538:5, 1538:24, 1546:17 important [19] -1307:11, 1309:15, 1309:18, 1324:2, 1324:11, 1347:6, 1388:10, 1388:11, 1389:12, 1393:13, 1394:5, 1408:3, 1494:14, 1500:2, 1501:18, 1502:10, 1505:19, 1507:3, 1539:24 Important [3] -1436:13, 1504:21, 1541:8 importantly [1] -1506:7

impossible [4] -

1333:3, 1333:18,

1333:21, 1531:23 impressed [1] -1471:13 **improper** [1] - 1502:13 improve [1] - 1421:25 improves [1] -1420:25 in-memory [1] -1300:1 inability [1] - 1334:7 inaccessible [1] -1529:6 inaccurate [2] -1360:6, 1381:10 inadvertently [1] -1541:8 INC [2] - 1290:4, 1290:7 incident [3] - 1326:17, 1434:19, 1494:15 incidents [1] -1326:24 include [28] - 1319:3, 1351:24, 1352:18, 1360:22, 1376:24, 1406:6, 1406:7, 1406:8, 1406:13, 1406:17, 1406:24, 1407:3, 1407:9, 1407:18, 1428:10, 1439:23, 1493:20, 1511:20, 1512:1, 1512:4, 1512:10, 1512:15, 1524:10, 1524:11, 1524:14, 1524:15 included [6] - 1339:7, 1365:24, 1377:1, 1404:19, 1408:1, 1477:9 includes [9] - 1331:1, 1338:1, 1406:10, 1406:22, 1407:19, 1407:20, 1482:25, 1528:24, 1547:14 including [14] -1297:7, 1298:7, 1318:1, 1319:4, 1373:5, 1373:17, 1441:2, 1442:5, 1471:24, 1472:8, 1476:4, 1482:25, 1514:9, 1543:24 inclusion [1] -1355:11 incomplete [2] -1360:6, 1450:15 inconsistency [1] -1392:15 inconsistent [1] -

1382:17 incorporate [10] -1407:5, 1407:10, 1510:2, 1510:4, 1513:20, 1523:3, 1523:21, 1524:11, 1527:22. 1540:3 incorporated [1] -1512:6 incorporates [2] -1510:25, 1513:14 incorporating [1] -1549:23 incorporation [1] -1512:11 incorrect [3] - 1345:1, 1427:23, 1431:16 incredibly [1] - 1525:7 incredulous [3] -1468:12, 1552:9, 1553:10 indecipherable [2] -1334:16, 1421:3 independent [9] -1297:22, 1311:25, 1315:14, 1342:25, 1402:16, 1405:22, 1412:4, 1479:4, 1511:15 independently [4] -1413:12, 1413:19, 1511:10, 1511:16 indicate [13] - 1314:5, 1331:5, 1372:25, 1383:12, 1396:2, 1406:22, 1411:2, 1460:10, 1472:13, 1515:7, 1519:9, 1535:9 indicated [13] -1318:14, 1346:22, 1357:8, 1361:11, 1361:24, 1367:2, 1371:5, 1372:2, 1388:7, 1390:10, 1439:9, 1460:14, 1462:14 indicates [7] - 1355:8, 1396:4, 1399:3, 1406:24, 1461:16, 1472:13, 1544:15 indicating [3] -1461:6, 1461:12, 1461:23 indication [5] -1344:4, 1365:6, 1365:8, 1372:3, 1457:18 indications [1] -1508:9

1385:23, 1521:10 indicator [2] -1384:21, 1535:1 indicia [1] - 1351:17 individual [7] -1327:22, 1327:23, 1431:20, 1439:1, 1477:9, 1491:25, 1547:19 individually [1] -1298:19 individuals [1] -1297:22 indulgence [1] -1403:16 industry [39] - 1298:1, 1298:15, 1299:4, 1299:7, 1300:17, 1300:18, 1300:22, 1300:25, 1301:6, 1303:2, 1303:3, 1303:8, 1303:13, 1303:17, 1303:21, 1304:11, 1305:12, 1305:17, 1305:18, 1305:24, 1313:25, 1317:3, 1328:10, 1334:11, 1335:4, 1335:6, 1337:25, 1339:16, 1441:8, 1442:18, 1442:19, 1485:15, 1485:16, 1485:17, 1486:24, 1507:15, 1512:14, 1532:19 inexplicably [1] -1325:12 infects [1] - 1524:7 infer [2] - 1337:4, 1437:14 informal [11] - 1375:3, 1375:6, 1375:10, 1468:5, 1477:1, 1494:13, 1494:14, 1494:23, 1527:2, 1552:23 information [15] -1303:3, 1304:20, 1320:7, 1320:16, 1320:22, 1322:9, 1323:7, 1356:2, 1369:23, 1408:6, 1408:7, 1408:8, 1410:2. 1439:12. 1547:11 **Infosys** [1] - 1297:10 infractions [1] -1326:20 infrastructure [4] -

indicative [2] -

				2.6
<b>know-how</b> [19] -	1332:17, 1335:13,	1403:24, 1465:12	1539:23	1510:17, 1510:20,
1367:15, 1367:23,	1335:23, 1337:19,	latitude [1] - 1383:25	left-hand [2] -	1528:25, 1529:2,
1370:14, 1370:15,	1341:7, 1342:5,	Laurie [4] - 1360:23,	1392:19, 1495:12	1529:8, 1529:15,
1448:9, 1448:12,	1344:19, 1345:6,	1493:20, 1520:15,	Legacy [4] - 1307:25,	1530:6, 1530:13,
1450:5, 1451:5,	1346:18, 1347:21,	1520:19	1308:3, 1308:16,	1530:15, 1531:16,
1480:8, 1495:19,	1403:7, 1441:4,	law [13] - 1292:9,	1309:5	1537:25, 1546:16,
1517:22, 1518:2,	1483:3, 1484:1,	1484:25, 1496:25,	legal [14] - 1320:11,	1547:1
1518:8, 1521:25,	1487:5, 1487:13,	1507:24, 1509:25,	1323:23, 1324:2,	licensed [5] - 1448:4,
1526:8, 1538:16,	1500:16, 1528:5,	1510:1, 1511:7,	1324:11, 1324:15,	1487:7, 1510:21,
1539:7, 1543:24	1531:9, 1532:6,	1510:1, 1511:1,	1327:9, 1333:17,	1512:8, 1538:1
knowing [1] - 1447:3	1532:20, 1543:1	1523:20, 1524:4,	1335:23, 1335:25,	licensee [15] - 1307:6,
knowledge [19] -	LANCHAK [2] -	1541:24, 1554:12	1336:5, 1345:15,	1307:7, 1314:23,
1447:3, 1447:12,	1291:17, 1560:4	Law [2] - 1290:17,	1415:7, 1479:20,	1342:17, 1345:7,
1447:16, 1447:17,	Lanchak's [2] -	1290:21	1550:10	1345:22, 1346:4,
1447:18, 1473:9,	1303:24, 1335:11	lawful [1] - 1543:23	length [3] - 1384:23,	1346:8, 1358:10,
1480:6, 1513:6,	landed [1] - 1505:18	lawyers [1] - 1531:18	1394:12, 1439:2	1363:17, 1475:23,
1516:12, 1517:15,	language [36] -	layer [16] - 1292:16,	lengthy [3] - 1404:3,	1477:21, 1529:17,
1518:6, 1518:7,	1295:13, 1362:5,	1292:23, 1293:12,	1438:7, 1537:2	1534:12, 1538:1
1518:13, 1518:14,	1363:2, 1363:4,	1292.23, 1293.12,	less [8] - 1432:13,	licensee's [5] -
1518:24, 1538:20,	1363:10, 1364:1,	1311:5, 1311:15,	1432:24, 1444:11,	1314:23, 1363:9,
1539:13, 1550:25	1364:12, 1377:9,	1314:22, 1317:17,	1496:9, 1506:24,	1363:15, 1363:24,
knowledgeable [1] -	1377:10, 1377:19,	1319:22, 1317:17,	1513:3, 1513:10,	1422:15
1487:15	1378:5, 1378:16,	1325:21, 1325:22,	1558:12	licensees [10] -
known [2] - 1367:18,	1383:10, 1383:21,	1346:12, 1347:10	letter [3] - 1320:4,	1306:13, 1306:21,
1446:15	1387:3, 1388:10,	layers [2] - 1346:25,	1320:15, 1455:2	1332:9, 1332:12,
knows [9] - 1292:14,	1402:6, 1407:1,	1442:6	level [8] - 1293:14,	1344:20, 1344:24,
1445:21, 1445:23,	1471:2, 1474:25,	lead [1] - 1557:23	1326:17, 1333:6,	1346:10, 1363:6,
1446:25, 1447:15,	1480:9, 1482:8,	leading [2] - 1368:10,	1333:9, 1387:20,	1363:25, 1531:6
1447:20, 1450:6,	1482:23, 1483:24,	1368:15	1393:20, 1393:21,	licensees' [1] - 1363:7
1450:9, 1545:12	1484:3, 1485:9,		1394-25	licenses [29] -
1450:9, 1545:12 <b>KPMG</b> (1) - 1338:1	1484:3, 1485:9, 1491:15, 1497:6,	learn [2] - 1499:2,	1394:25 levels (1) - 1326:15	licenses [29] - 1305:16. 1307:25.
1450:9, 1545:12 <b>KPMG</b> [1] - 1338:1	1484:3, 1485:9, 1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3,	<b>learn</b> [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3	levels [1] - 1326:15	1305:16, 1307:25,
<b>KPMG</b> [1] - 1338:1	1491:15, 1497:6,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12	• •
•	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16,
<b>KPMG</b> [1] - 1338:1	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8,
KPMG [1] - 1338:1	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23,
KPMG [1] - 1338:1  L  label [1] - 1455:1	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20,
KPMG [1] - 1338:1  L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] -	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3,
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25,
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20,
L  label [1] - 1338:1  L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6,
L  label [1] - 1338:1  L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:9,
L  label [1] - 1338:1  L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:9, 1347:14, 1347:16,
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3
L  label [1] - 1338:1  L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4,
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:25
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] -	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14  laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8  large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21  largely [1] - 1557:1  larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20  LARRY [1] - 1290:2  last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:14, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3   licensing [1] - 1484:1   life [1] - 1291:24   lifted [1] - 1484:17   Light [1] - 1457:2
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14 languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1484:17
L  label [1] - 1435:1  labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8  labeling [1] - 1419:15  labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9  lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17  laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12  Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14  laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8  large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21  largely [1] - 1557:1  larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20  LARRY [1] - 1290:2  last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:14, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3   licensing [1] - 1484:1   life [1] - 1291:24   lifted [1] - 1484:17   Light [1] - 1457:2
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14  laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8  large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21  largely [1] - 1557:1  larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20  LARRY [1] - 1290:2  last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1353:14	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:12, 1342:14, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] -
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1302:16, 1305:11,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14  laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8  large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21  largely [1] - 1557:1  larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20  LARRY [1] - 1290:2  last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1533:6	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1484:17 Light [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1302:16, 1305:11, 1305:23, 1309:4,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23, 1541:21, 1544:7,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1533:6 left [19] - 1292:7,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1, 1445:3, 1468:3,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:25 lifecycle [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25 likely [2] - 1293:9, 1416:12 limit [1] - 1484:8
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1305:23, 1309:4, 1309:25, 1311:14,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23, 1541:21, 1544:7, 1544:10, 1544:20,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1533:6 left [19] - 1292:7, 1365:12, 1381:20,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:12, 1342:14, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1, 1445:3, 1468:3, 1474:9, 1476:20,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1484:17 Light [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25 likely [2] - 1293:9, 1416:12 limit [1] - 1484:8 limitations [1] -
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1305:23, 1309:4, 1309:25, 1311:14, 1314:10, 1317:19,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23, 1541:21, 1544:7, 1544:10, 1544:20, 1556:2, 1556:8,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1533:6 left [19] - 1292:7, 1365:12, 1381:20, 1392:19, 1402:19,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:12, 1342:14, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1, 1445:3, 1468:3, 1474:9, 1476:20, 1481:15, 1482:14,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25 likely [2] - 1293:9, 1416:12 limit [1] - 1484:8 limitations [1] - 1484:4
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1305:23, 1309:4, 1309:25, 1311:14, 1314:10, 1317:19, 1318:14, 1320:7,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23, 1541:21, 1544:7, 1544:10, 1544:20, 1556:2, 1556:8, 1557:12	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1353:14 leaving [1] - 1533:6 left [19] - 1292:7, 1365:12, 1381:20, 1392:19, 1402:19, 1403:14, 1432:12,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:12, 1342:14, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1, 1445:3, 1468:3, 1474:9, 1476:20, 1481:15, 1482:14, 1482:17, 1484:13,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1347:6, 1347:6, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1484:17 Light [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25 likely [2] - 1293:9, 1416:12 limit [1] - 1484:8 limitations [1] - 1484:4 limited [6] - 1319:5,
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1305:23, 1309:4, 1309:25, 1311:14, 1314:10, 1317:19, 1318:14, 1320:7, 1321:19, 1323:13,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20  LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23, 1541:21, 1544:7, 1544:10, 1544:20, 1556:2, 1556:8, 1557:12 lastly [2] - 1293:7,	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1353:14 leaving [1] - 1533:6 left [19] - 1292:7, 1365:12, 1381:20, 1392:19, 1402:19, 1403:14, 1432:12, 1432:13, 1432:17, 1432:24, 1495:12, 1499:17, 1502:15,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:12, 1342:14, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1, 1445:3, 1468:3, 1474:9, 1476:20, 1481:15, 1482:14, 1482:17, 1484:13, 1487:9, 1491:12,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1484:17 Light [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25 likely [2] - 1293:9, 1416:12 limit [1] - 1484:8 limitations [1] - 1484:4 limited [6] - 1319:5, 1341:3, 1394:11,
L  label [1] - 1455:1 labeled [3] - 1436:13, 1504:20, 1541:8 labeling [1] - 1419:15 labels [3] - 1309:16, 1347:3, 1528:9 lack [7] - 1473:25, 1477:12, 1478:24, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1551:21, 1552:17 laid [3] - 1388:24, 1487:23, 1544:12 Lanchak [48] - 1291:11, 1291:15, 1292:4, 1293:17, 1293:25, 1296:1, 1296:7, 1297:25, 1299:19, 1301:4, 1305:23, 1309:4, 1309:25, 1311:14, 1314:10, 1317:19, 1318:14, 1320:7,	1491:15, 1497:6, 1507:16, 1526:3, 1528:2, 1545:25, 1546:5, 1546:8, 1552:14  languages [3] - 1383:25, 1406:14 laptop [2] - 1299:25, 1300:8 large [2] - 1339:8, 1556:21 largely [1] - 1557:1 larger [2] - 1292:11, 1342:20 LARRY [1] - 1290:2 last [23] - 1384:17, 1388:3, 1399:22, 1426:4, 1426:5, 1426:16, 1436:8, 1447:11, 1466:10, 1468:23, 1498:23, 1501:2, 1502:10, 1511:19, 1539:23, 1541:21, 1544:7, 1544:10, 1544:20, 1556:2, 1556:8, 1557:12	learn [2] - 1499:2, 1499:3 learned [8] - 1467:6, 1467:15, 1467:24, 1468:5, 1478:4, 1492:24, 1495:16, 1499:5 learning [1] - 1489:17 least [19] - 1317:11, 1329:4, 1340:20, 1362:9, 1368:17, 1399:6, 1402:8, 1405:17, 1418:13, 1436:25, 1437:1, 1442:2, 1443:5, 1445:6, 1467:7, 1473:16, 1496:14, 1498:10, 1557:1 leave [3] - 1353:12, 1432:13, 1465:13 leaves [1] - 1353:14 leaving [1] - 1533:6 left [19] - 1292:7, 1365:12, 1381:20, 1392:19, 1402:19, 1403:14, 1432:12, 1432:13, 1432:17, 1432:24, 1495:12,	levels [1] - 1326:15 liable [1] - 1481:12 library [4] - 1396:8, 1396:10, 1396:11, 1473:13 license [65] - 1307:4, 1307:22, 1308:11, 1309:5, 1309:12, 1309:13, 1309:14, 1309:19, 1309:25, 1311:8, 1320:21, 1323:4, 1332:25, 1337:11, 1337:15, 1337:17, 1337:19, 1337:20, 1338:16, 1339:13, 1339:17, 1339:19, 1341:12, 1342:5, 1342:7, 1342:10, 1342:12, 1342:14, 1342:15, 1342:16, 1342:17, 1343:18, 1346:3, 1346:8, 1432:1, 1445:3, 1468:3, 1474:9, 1476:20, 1481:15, 1482:14, 1482:17, 1484:13,	1305:16, 1307:25, 1308:3, 1308:16, 1308:25, 1309:8, 1310:20, 1319:23, 1332:18, 1332:20, 1337:13, 1340:3, 1341:14, 1343:25, 1346:10, 1346:20, 1347:1, 1347:6, 1347:8, 1347:16, 1432:3, 1476:15, 1476:19, 1484:4, 1487:15, 1538:3 licensing [1] - 1484:1 life [1] - 1291:24 lifted [1] - 1457:2 likelihood [2] - 1377:24, 1388:25 likely [2] - 1293:9, 1416:12 limit [1] - 1484:8 limitations [1] - 1484:4 limited [6] - 1319:5,

1479:17, 1497:1,

1508:19, 1509:4 lining [1] - 1400:6 list [25] - 1297:10, 1303:25, 1304:15, 1340:24, 1340:25, 1341:2, 1376:5, 1376:23, 1377:1, 1377:3, 1377:6, 1377:10, 1377:14, 1377:21, 1378:3, 1388:16, 1391:4, 1391:8, 1391:16, 1391:21, 1393:2, 1395:10, 1401:1, 1438:2, 1438:3 listed [2] - 1376:20, 1490:20 listening [1] - 1412:6 listing [4] - 1355:7, 1355:10, 1396:15, 1398:5 listings [1] - 1397:25 lists [1] - 1377:8 litany [2] - 1486:23, 1543:12 literal [3] - 1510:4, 1523:22, 1524:1 literally [2] - 1329:16, 1531:8 literature [1] - 1548:17 litigant [1] - 1543:8 litigate [2] - 1474:5, 1474:14 litigating [2] -1483:15, 1483:16 litigation [5] -1302:13, 1304:8, 1537:1, 1540:15, 1540:16 live [1] - 1490:2 Liversidge [5] -1290:20, 1291:11, 1343:3, 1560:4, 1560:5 LIVERSIDGE [49] -1291:13, 1291:20, 1292:1, 1292:3, 1293:24, 1296:4, 1296:6, 1299:3, 1299:16, 1299:18, 1301:9, 1301:12, 1303:20, 1304:2, 1304:25, 1305:9, 1305:10, 1305:22, 1306:15, 1306:18, 1308:7, 1308:9, 1309:22, 1309:24, 1311:11, 1311:13, 1318:10, 1318:13,

1318:16, 1318:19,

1318:21, 1320:2, 1320:6, 1321:12, 1321:14, 1324:8, 1328:18, 1328:20, 1330:9, 1330:11, 1331:13, 1340:15, 1340:22, 1345:15, 1346:15, 1346:17, 1347:17, 1347:24, 1459:9 LLCs [3] - 1297:19, 1342:24, 1343:6 load [2] - 1506:21, 1506:23 loaded [1] - 1354:25 loads [1] - 1506:24 local [19] - 1422:3, 1422:4, 1422:19, 1422:23, 1423:4, 1424:1, 1424:3, 1435:6, 1439:14, 1503:12, 1503:14, 1506:8, 1506:11, 1537:20, 1538:2, 1538:5, 1538:14, 1538:24 locally [3] - 1424:6, 1438:24, 1503:24 lodge [1] - 1555:4 log [9] - 1354:20, 1372:23, 1372:24, 1372:25, 1435:24, 1436:3, 1436:18, 1436:23, 1526:23 logged [2] - 1520:16, 1521:7 logic [4] - 1377:24, 1396:25, 1397:12, 1401:19 logs [6] - 1358:18, 1371:8, 1371:10, 1371:12, 1371:18, 1436:15 look [50] - 1311:19, 1312:14, 1318:25, 1326:9, 1326:11, 1328:1, 1328:24, 1329:22, 1341:9, 1341:17, 1360:20, 1364:8, 1364:11, 1367:13, 1368:12, 1371:25, 1374:13, 1378:11, 1378:14, 1378:18, 1381:23, 1381:25, 1382:3, 1391:8, 1393:16, 1407:17, 1407:21, 1409:25. 1416:18. 1427:21, 1428:15, 1429:8, 1430:15,

1450:18, 1451:12, 1454:4, 1456:4, 1458:8, 1461:17, 1469:4, 1477:22, 1484:19, 1486:19, 1499:19, 1521:3, 1527:15, 1531:22, 1531:23, 1538:22, 1558:13 looked [9] - 1304:15, 1332:20, 1347:8, 1371:12, 1380:10, 1392:20, 1446:6, 1460:6, 1488:20 looking [21] - 1325:21, 1329:16, 1340:10, 1354:6, 1360:15, 1377:21, 1381:19, 1386:10, 1392:17, 1395:10, 1395:13, 1397:25, 1405:2, 1407:22, 1439:11, 1457:16, 1459:12, 1487:8, 1556:3, 1558:6, 1558:11 looks [1] - 1351:20 loosely [1] - 1357:18 lovely [1] - 1485:17 lower [2] - 1379:22, 1557:14 lucidity [1] - 1539:24 ludicrous [2] - 1300:5, 1329:23 lunch [4] - 1315:21, 1402:20, 1402:23, 1403:6 M Ma'am [1] - 1393:24

MacEachern [1] -1489:12 machine [3] - 1329:6, 1329:8, 1383:22 machine-generated [1] - 1383:22 machines [1] -1413:21 MacKereth [18] -1433:11, 1433:18, 1468:11, 1473:20, 1477:10, 1483:22, 1485:25, 1486:9, 1486:14, 1490:10, 1500:15, 1504:24, 1532:6, 1534:19, 1541:12, 1545:6, 1545:8, 1552:7 MacKereth's [2] -1355:19, 1356:7

madam [2] - 1554:13, 1555:1 Madam [1] - 1554:19 made-up [2] -1440:25, 1533:20 mail [22] - 1365:7, 1367:14, 1368:12, 1368:21, 1369:13, 1369:24, 1372:6, 1374:14, 1374:15, 1405:1, 1405:3, 1405:7, 1405:9, 1433:24, 1435:15, 1441:4, 1445:13, 1446:10, 1446:20, 1489:23, 1493:24, 1521:16 mailed [2] - 1488:8, 1498:10 mailing [1] - 1498:17 mails [11] - 1435:14, 1435:24, 1436:1, 1441:24, 1441:25, 1442:4, 1442:7, 1504:8, 1514:4, 1515:7, 1515:8 MAIN [16] - 1397:12, 1398:21, 1399:1, 1399:2, 1399:7, 1399:20, 1454:15, 1454:21, 1454:22, 1455:6, 1455:23, 1455:25, 1457:10, 1457:21, 1458:1 main [7] - 1383:16, 1398:13, 1454:18, 1454:19, 1454:20, 1454:25, 1455:1 MAIN'S [1] - 1399:8 MAIN-EXIT [8] -1398:21, 1399:1, 1399:2, 1399:20, 1457:10, 1457:21, 1458:1 maintain [5] - 1321:5, 1321:6, 1333:3, 1389:19, 1441:12 maintained [1] -1545:22 maintaining [1] -1532:22 maintenance [14] -1291:25, 1292:6, 1293:15, 1294:4, 1294:17, 1297:8, 1297:23, 1302:23, 1303:6, 1326:25, 1328:8, 1328:11, 1339:8, 1441:11

major [2] - 1292:15,

1317:25, 1318:7,

1334:10, 1434:18, 1436:16, 1437:3, 1545:3 math [4] - 1432:15, 1432:23, 1433:4, 1433:8 Matheson [21] -1358:25, 1371:23, 1372:22, 1373:5, 1374:11, 1374:17, 1480:2, 1490:17, 1490:21, 1491:5, 1494:25, 1495:4, 1495:6, 1526:21, 1526:22, 1526:24, 1527:1, 1527:3, 1527:8, 1527:12, 1549:1 Matheson's [4] -1372:8, 1372:21, 1527:8, 1527:13 Mathew [3] - 1318:4, 1336:15, 1349:12 Matt [13] - 1335:10, 1336:17, 1340:4, 1340:8, 1345:3, 1362:25, 1365:1, 1376:14, 1377:14, 1386:1, 1398:20, 1405:4, 1469:4 matter [19] - 1366:1, 1375:23, 1379:3, 1412:23, 1419:21, 1442:17, 1465:2, 1496:15, 1500:2, 1515:11, 1521:2, 1524:4, 1533:24, 1534:10, 1540:24, 1558:20. 1558:25. 1559:7 mattered [1] - 1486:7 matters [4] - 1347:25, 1348:18, 1528:10, 1553:17 Maurya [2] - 1357:9, 1437:11 McCracken [31] -1290:21, 1348:15, 1348:21, 1349:3, 1349:11, 1349:19, 1349:22, 1350:4, 1350:7, 1350:8, 1368:10, 1452:2, 1452:3, 1452:12, 1452:14, 1452:18, 1454:3, 1454:7, 1456:3, 1456:10, 1457:8, 1457:11, 1458:4, 1458:7, 1459:15, 1463:5,

1464:1, 1464:4, 1464:13, 1465:7, 1560:12 MCCRACKEN[1] -1348:17 McCutchen [1] -1320:12 mean [27] - 1292:14, 1293:7. 1312:25. 1333:11, 1362:23, 1371:7, 1375:24, 1381:8, 1405:1, 1409:21, 1412:24, 1416:1, 1417:14, 1422:4, 1422:23, 1423:4, 1424:3, 1424:18, 1433:3, 1449:17, 1455:21, 1455:22, 1483:4, 1485:19, 1508:10, 1532:13, 1536:23 meaningful [7] -1327:6, 1333:4, 1333:9, 1333:15, 1542:24, 1542:25, 1543:2 meaningless [1] -1483:19 MEANS[1] - 1441:14 means [14] - 1292:20, 1319:20, 1325:15, 1326:5, 1326:17, 1337:11, 1338:10, 1461:19, 1468:6, 1478:19, 1481:5, 1483:4, 1483:18, 1485:19 meant [2] - 1340:14, 1345:25 measurable [1] -1315:16 Medical [1] - 1498:11 medium [1] - 1297:14 medium-sized [1] -1297:14 meet [2] - 1303:10, 1303:15 meetings [6] -1298:10, 1298:18, 1298:19, 1298:20, 1303:14, 1314:15 members [1] -1556:23 memorize [4] -1444:1, 1513:1, 1519:6, 1522:14 memory [1] - 1300:1 mention [1] - 1328:23 mentioned [18] -1291:23, 1297:18,

1302:21, 1303:1, 1332:23, 1336:25, 1339:4, 1342:5, 1343:4, 1343:8, 1343:24, 1373:24, 1374:2, 1421:9, 1434:10, 1455:16, 1508:16, 1556:7 mentions [2] -1377:21, 1551:8 mere [1] - 1347:3 merely [4] - 1370:14, 1372:25, 1442:17, 1535:20 merging [1] - 1511:22 message [2] - 1471:5, 1504:16 met [3] - 1352:10, 1502:9, 1515:3 method [7] - 1327:3, 1327:7, 1327:11, 1328:12, 1433:20, 1548:16, 1548:21 methodical [1] -1501:15 methodically [1] -1508:6 methodology [5] -1375:18, 1375:22, 1378:24, 1379:1, 1399:25 methods [1] - 1433:23 Michigan [2] -1410:17, 1410:18 Microsoft [2] -1497:14, 1497:15 Microstar [4] - 1492:3, 1492:14, 1497:15, 1550:6 midafternoon [1] -1464:12 middle [2] - 1329:21, 1398:1 midsummer [1] -1558:2 might [13] - 1292:14, 1292:22, 1375:9, 1382:11, 1385:7, 1391:19, 1391:20, 1394:9, 1401:18, 1406:25, 1416:2, 1437:13, 1460:12 Miller [2] - 1320:4, 1531:12 millions [2] - 1325:3, 1540:20 mind [4] - 1315:5, 1502:6, 1554:14, 1555:12 minimus [3] -

**-**2.6 1415:13, 1463:4, 1535:17 minute [4] - 1380:19, 1392:21, 1392:23, 1421:4 minutes [12] -1402:19, 1403:13, 1452:5, 1465:22, 1477:17, 1479:3, 1499:17, 1499:20, 1500:19, 1541:22, 1544:8 misaligned [2] -1519:9, 1526:20 misalignment [1] -1515:15 misleading [1] -1508:15 misled [1] - 1472:7 missed [1] - 1541:7 missing [1] - 1556:22 misstated [1] - 1494:6 misstatement [1] -1435:8 mistakes [1] - 1464:24 mistyped[1] -1382:12 mixed [1] - 1464:20 modal [1] - 1317:7 model [8] - 1329:25, 1466:24, 1467:14, 1468:18, 1473:16, 1473:22. 1504:1. 1544:18 models [2] - 1474:1, 1484:25 modification [5] -1295:3, 1343:7, 1389:8, 1405:16, 1550:1 modifications [1] -1405:23 modified [7] -1291:23, 1357:9, 1357:13, 1441:21, 1501:12, 1532:16, 1532:17 modifies [3] -1476:24, 1510:15, 1511:8 modify [21] - 1294:20, 1295:10, 1296:15, 1296:18, 1298:16, 1298:23, 1305:13, 1312:11, 1313:15, 1324:23, 1331:9, 1408:6, 1441:13, 1441:18, 1487:6, 1501:11, 1501:13, 1531:24, 1532:16,

1552:14, 1553:14,

1553:16, 1556:14

ordered [1] - 1503:23

orders [6] - 1473:17,

1432:6, 1432:8,
1432:10, 1432:21,
1434:3, 1434:8,
1434:10, 1440:22,
1442:11, 1442:24,
1442:25, 1443:2, 1451:20, 1452:21,
1453:1, 1453:3,
1456:4, 1456:8,
1457:17, 1458:6,
1459:13, 1459:14,
1462:24, 1465:4, 1466:11, 1468:23,
1466:11, 1468:23,
1469:6, 1472:7,
1477:2, 1478:17,
1481:5, 1487:24, 1488:4, 1499:3,
1499:4, 1500:18,
1501:7, 1501:12,
1501:19, 1502:19,
1503:4, 1503:9,
1504:13, 1505:9,
1506:5, 1506:12,
1510:12, 1510:25,
1511:2, 1511:19,
1511:21, 1511:25,
1512:5, 1512:12,
1513:14, 1513:20,
1516:19, 1519:6, 1519:16, 1519:19,
1519.16, 1519.19, 1520:7, 1520:14,
1523:3, 1524:2,
1524:10, 1524:12,
1524:18, 1524:25,
1525:2, 1525:9,
1525:10, 1525:11,
1525:18, 1527:20,
1527:22, 1528:9,
1528:21, 1529:23,
1530:1, 1530:5,
1530:12, 1530:18,
1531:2, 1531:5, 1532:14, 1532:16,
1532:22, 1532:23,
1532:25, 1533:18,
1533:23, 1534:13,
1533:23, 1534:13, 1535:14, 1535:15,
1535:25, 1536:24,
1537:3, 1537:11,
1538:5, 1538:11,
1538:21, 1539:19,
1540:3, 1540:10,
1541:5, 1541:6, 1541:13, 1542:1
1541:13, 1542:1, 1542:9, 1542:14,
1542:17, 1543:5,
1547:7, 1547:10,
1547:12, 1547:14,
1547:16, 1552:17
Oracle's [65] - 1304:3,
1318:2, 1320:19,

```
1320:20, 1321:8,
 1321:9, 1322:1,
 1322:25, 1323:4,
 1344:19, 1344:23,
 1346:2, 1346:7,
 1350:5, 1352:4,
 1408:18, 1411:8,
 1415:2, 1435:18,
 1440:16, 1441:19,
 1444:20, 1466:25,
 1473:3, 1473:18,
 1474:6, 1474:7,
 1478:24, 1485:3,
 1486:17, 1487:1,
 1491:20, 1501:6,
 1501:21, 1502:12,
 1502:17, 1503:19,
 1504:15, 1504:16,
 1506:8, 1513:6,
 1514:12, 1517:24,
 1518:22, 1520:13,
 1521:4, 1526:5,
 1526:13, 1528:17,
 1530:2, 1530:8,
 1531:11, 1531:15,
 1531:18, 1534:4,
 1536:3, 1536:7,
 1538:7, 1539:4,
 1541:21, 1543:12,
 1543:19, 1544:6
Oracle-provided [3] -
 1298:17, 1299:9,
 1418:24
Oracle-written [1] -
 1418:20
ORCORST-00639707
[1] - 1303:22
order [51] - 1311:6,
 1311:16, 1329:17,
 1331:10, 1341:13,
 1354:7, 1354:8,
 1354:21, 1365:18,
 1366:16, 1366:23,
 1370:24, 1391:2,
 1391:22, 1393:3,
 1394:24, 1401:2,
 1421:25, 1442:22,
 1467:5, 1467:14,
 1467:17, 1469:2,
 1471:22, 1472:25,
 1476:7, 1480:13,
 1491:23, 1491:24.
 1499:4, 1512:24,
 1519:4, 1519:5,
 1522:17, 1536:17,
 1536:22, 1540:18,
 1541:2, 1541:4,
 1541:25, 1543:3,
 1544:19, 1545:17,
 1546:21, 1547:1,
 1547:2, 1550:2,
```

```
1522:13, 1522:17,
 1543:20, 1553:12,
 1553:23
Oregon [2] - 1514:1,
 1519:25
OREX [3] - 1426:14,
 1428:21, 1430:15
OREX_27 [1] -
 1365:23
OREX_67 [2] - 1309:2,
 1487:9
organization [2] -
 1509:2, 1509:6
organize [1] - 1414:17
organized [1] -
 1414:15
orient [5] - 1381:19,
 1454{:}12,\,1513{:}22,\,
 1519:8, 1526:19
oriented [2] - 1340:1,
 1390:13
original [11] - 1357:2,
 1474:7, 1474:22,
 1474:24, 1478:23,
 1480:22, 1480:24,
 1481:8, 1481:13,
 1533:10, 1548:11
originally [5] -
 1310:21, 1413:4,
 1420:5, 1431:1,
 1533:7
orphan [2] - 1380:9,
 1509:8
OSC [5] - 1500:4,
 1505:11, 1512:23,
 1536:15, 1544:1
otherwise [8] -
 1310:6, 1419:16,
 1427:19, 1472:13,
 1472:14, 1472:15,
 1538:18, 1545:24
ourselves [2] -
 1513:22, 1552:5
outlined [1] - 1453:17
outlining [1] - 1357:23
outreach [2] - 1505:1,
 1505:7
outset [2] - 1370:18,
 1442:10
outside [10] - 1302:13,
 1302:14, 1320:11,
 1365:20, 1405:22,
 1411:21, 1412:14,
 1435:2, 1435:16,
 1476:19
outsourcing [1] -
```

```
over-the-shoulder [7]
 - 1327:3, 1327:7,
 1327:11, 1328:12,
 1328:16, 1334:3,
 1485:21
overall [1] - 1544:14
overreached[1] -
 1494:6
OWEN [1] - 1452:10
Owen [2] - 1500:15,
 1560:12
own [20] - 1300:8,
 1311:3, 1360:7,
 1363:9, 1422:15,
 1472:17, 1485:12,
 1486:11, 1503:19,
 1504:2, 1505:6,
 1510:10, 1514:17,
 1515:5, 1530:12,
 1539:4, 1539:22,
 1543:24, 1545:7,
 1558:10
          Ρ
```

1313:8

```
P.M [1] - 1403:1
package [4] - 1371:13,
 1371:16, 1373:1,
 1421:2
packaged [1] -
 1421:16
page [55] - 1301:13,
 1306:16, 1318:17,
 1321:13, 1330:10,
 1335:11, 1340:8,
 1341:9, 1352:15,
 1352:17, 1353:15,
 1365:5, 1365:23,
 1368:22, 1369:3,
 1371:25, 1372:11,
 1381:3, 1381:9,
 1381:25, 1384:3,
 1388:9, 1390:21,
 1390:23, 1392:15,
 1393:7, 1393:16,
 1393:17, 1395:15,
 1395:21, 1395:24,
 1396:17, 1396:18,
 1398:13, 1398:15,
 1399:22, 1399:23,
 1401:4, 1404:7,
 1407:23, 1409:4,
 1409:5, 1410:12,
 1423:11, 1423:12,
 1454:4, 1454:5,
 1456:4, 1457:8,
 1457:9, 1457:10,
 1458:4, 1487:23
PAGE [1] - 1560:3
```

1525:6 paid [2] - 1325:16, 1325:17 painstaking [1] -1525:5 pandemic [3] -1555:15, 1556:2, 1558:11 paragraph [66] -1312:3, 1312:14, 1318:12, 1318:20, 1318:25, 1321:16, 1322:7, 1330:4, 1330:5, 1330:13, 1330:15, 1330:19, 1330:22, 1331:5, 1331:6, 1336:18, 1345:4, 1362:20, 1362:22, 1362:23, 1362:24, 1363:4, 1363:18, 1364:7, 1364:9, 1376:13, 1377:2, 1377:12, 1377:14, 1397:13, 1397:14, 1422:7, 1422:9, 1422:10, 1423:2, 1423:3, 1425:9, 1425:10, 1431:3, 1432:16, 1475:17, 1475:22, 1477:19, 1477:20, 1483:18, 1486:17, 1486:19, 1486:20, 1497:25, 1498:15, 1498:16, 1498:18, 1499:8, 1530:5, 1534:5, 1534:7, 1534:10, 1534:12, 1536:11, 1536:17, 1536:23, 1537:8, 1537:15, 1550:11 paragraphs [6] -1321:21, 1330:12, 1363:3, 1363:22, 1364:5, 1478:20 parameter [20] -1391:7, 1396:9, 1421:13, 1421:14, 1421:15, 1444:22, 1445:10, 1445:16, 1445:17, 1445:20, 1445:21, 1446:25, 1448:2, 1516:15, 1516:25, 1517:5, 1517:10, 1518:3, 1518:4 parameters [12] -1370:16, 1391:1, 1391:9, 1391:15,

pages [2] - 1395:15,

1506:20, 1508:5,

pronounce [2] -1456:14, 1456:15 proof [17] - 1440:1, 1440:9, 1440:11, 1440:13, 1440:21, 1441:2, 1469:5, 1514:13, 1519:17, 1522:25, 1523:16, 1524:9, 1525:3, 1535:25, 1540:6, 1544:12, 1544:13 proper [5] - 1322:3, 1427:6, 1492:16, 1503:8, 1530:19 properly [2] - 1295:10, property [7] - 1310:25, 1320:20, 1321:8, 1323:1, 1489:5, 1530:2, 1531:15 proportional [1] proposal [1] - 1556:21 propose [1] - 1544:8 proposed [3] -1304:21, 1369:2, proposition [2] -1555:24, 1556:11 proprietary [1] protect [2] - 1310:19, protectability [3] -1415:3, 1415:9, protected [17] -1407:5, 1453:7, 1453:10, 1453:12, 1453:18, 1457:6, 1458:17, 1481:10, 1510:3, 1510:5, 1512:12, 1523:1, 1523:3, 1523:21, 1527:22. 1548:6. protectible [43] -1415:16, 1415:18, 1415:22, 1415:25, 1416:5, 1416:11, 1416:15, 1416:21, 1417:1, 1417:3, 1417:23, 1418:8, 1418:17, 1419:9, 1419:14, 1420:9, 1420:16, 1421:10, 1421:22, 1453:20, 1453:25, 1454:20, 1454:22, 1455:1,

1455:15, 1457:25, 1458:2, 1458:22, 1458:23, 1461:1, 1461:2, 1462:12, 1462:22, 1463:1, 1507:19, 1507:24, 1508:3, 1508:8, 1508:11, 1540:3, 1548:11 prototypes [1] -1476:4 prove [4] - 1501:20, 1501:22, 1503:3, 1514:15 **proved** [3] - 1519:11, 1519:18, 1523:15 proven [5] - 1469:6, 1481:5, 1502:1, 1515:4, 1527:18 provide [25] - 1296:17, 1312:16, 1313:13, 1327:9, 1329:17, 1331:10, 1333:7, 1333:22, 1334:1, 1334:7, 1335:14, 1335:17, 1356:17, 1371:10, 1387:21, 1395:11, 1424:22, 1426:7, 1436:3, 1441:13, 1443:10, 1476:25, 1514:7, 1530:9, 1546:23 provided [39] -1295:1, 1295:23, 1298:17, 1299:9, 1307:20, 1307:21, 1312:17, 1313:24, 1314:18, 1320:17, 1327:5, 1328:10, 1332:11, 1335:8, 1351:10, 1355:2, 1355:7, 1356:2, 1357:15, 1388:9, 1389:9, 1391:15, 1392:6, 1395:20, 1406:1, 1406:3, 1409:8, 1415:1, 1418:24, 1425:7, 1427:10, 1437:16, 1439:7, 1439:8, 1446:10, 1483:11, 1514:8, 1540:19, 1551:11 provider [10] -1294:17, 1294:20, 1297:16, 1300:11, 1317:20, 1325:14, 1333:22, 1333:25, 1487:11, 1501:11 providers [10] -

**-**33

1405:18, 1408:2, 1458:25, 1465:24 reminder [1] - 1504:17 remote [3] - 1329:6, 1329:25, 1504:1 remotely [10] - 1326:9, 1328:15, 1329:2, 1329:4, 1329:8, 1329:25, 1334:1, 1337:2, 1409:24, 1545:1 removed [1] - 1468:19 renamed [1] - 1352:1 render [1] - 1486:17 rendered [1] - 1330:5 renders [2] - 1331:11, 1534:7 Renewable [1] -1316:23 RENO [2] - 1291:1, 1403:1 Reno [2] - 1290:7, 1290:24 repeat [11] - 1324:7, 1328:6, 1338:24, 1339:14, 1343:20, 1344:22, 1346:6, 1380:5, 1412:6, 1468:2, 1547:24 repeated [1] - 1539:16 replicate [3] - 1444:3. 1513:2. 1519:6 reply [2] - 1489:24, 1544:6 report [33] - 1303:12, 1315:11, 1356:1, 1376:14, 1377:2, 1415:5, 1415:6, 1425:3, 1425:4, 1425:7, 1425:9, 1426:15, 1427:3, 1427:10, 1427:16, 1427:18, 1427:22, 1428:4, 1428:7, 1428:23, 1429:1, 1431:3, 1433:22, 1434:19, 1437:19, 1451:20, 1451:21, 1451:22, 1496:3, 1505:13, 1550:17, 1550:21 reported [10] -1364:23, 1366:22, 1436:17, 1437:4, 1489:3, 1490:5, 1490:7, 1495:22, 1496:3, 1503:1 Reported [1] -

1290:23

remind [5] - 1388:11,

relation [1] - 1302:22

1522:3

1373:25, 1374:9,

1409.6

requires [3] - 1534:1,

1543:14, 1552:14

resale [2] - 1338:15, 1340.1 research [3] - 1336:3, 1351:22, 1413:17 reservation [1] -1396:22 reserve [2] - 1387:23, 1465:22 reserved [3] -1348:22, 1383:14, 1383:20 resolve [2] - 1354:22, 1366:24 resolved [3] -1326:18, 1350:4, 1516:18 respect [49] - 1302:6, 1352:8, 1355:6, 1357:7, 1358:7, 1359:20, 1360:11, 1361:9, 1362:2, 1362:21, 1363:11, 1370:19, 1373:2, 1380:17, 1383:11, 1384:1, 1386:6, 1386:10, 1387:6, 1387:16, 1387:19, 1389:3, 1389:7, 1389:21, 1405:1, 1415:13, 1431:13, 1433:19, 1436:5, 1437:6, 1438:10, 1463:17, 1474:9, 1474:10, 1480:2, 1481:8, 1505:25, 1510:19, 1511:25, 1523:17, 1538:14, 1538:15, 1538:21, 1542:5, 1545:24, 1547:4, 1548:24, 1551:5 respectful [5] -1320:18, 1321:7, 1472:12, 1530:1, 1531:14 respectfully [1] -1543:25 respects [3] - 1303:8, 1543:19 respond [4] - 1304:12, 1316:15, 1321:21, 1545:3 responded [1] -1316:13 response [11] -1319:24, 1400:3, 1435:6, 1435:19, 1438:25, 1449:8, 1456:21, 1469:20,

1469:21, 1541:3,

1542:2 responses [1] -1294:2 responsibility [2] -1469:25, 1484:23 responsive [3] -1295:4, 1326:23, 1419:6 rest [2] - 1297:7, 1534:7 restricted [1] -1312:18 restriction [8] -1308:12, 1432:2, 1432:5, 1506:8, 1506:9, 1506:11, 1506:13, 1537:23 rests [2] - 1348:19, 1350:5 result [10] - 1323:20, 1328:1, 1375:9, 1402:1, 1406:17, 1466:24, 1468:10, 1482:8, 1482:20, 1509:4 resulted [3] - 1353:1, 1431:8, 1483:25 resulting [1] - 1481:22 results [4] - 1352:14, 1428:9, 1429:1, 1483:24 Resumed [1] - 1560:4 RESUMED [2] -1291:19, 1404:14 retired [1] - 1413:6 retract [1] - 1380:8 retracted [2] -1509:11, 1509:19 retrieve [1] - 1414:17 retrieved [1] - 1414:16 retroactive [1] -1525:19 retroactively[1] -1526:14 return [6] - 1366:25, 1461:4, 1461:17, 1461:22, 1461:23, 1462:15 returning [1] - 1371:4 retype [2] - 1522:3, 1522:16 retyped [1] - 1449:22 reusable [2] -1406:15, 1406:25 reuse [17] - 1358:9, 1447:16, 1447:17, 1448:25, 1513:2, 1513:5, 1516:11, 1516:12, 1517:15, 1517:21, 1518:7,

1518:24, 1521:24, 1538:16, 1538:20, 1539:13, 1543:24 reuses [1] - 1526:8 reusing [3] - 1480:6, 1518:13, 1518:14 revealed [7] - 1351:22, 1429:1, 1466:13, 1466:16, 1466:18, 1494:15, 1552:21 reveals [1] - 1553:21 reverse [5] - 1307:23, 1308:4, 1308:13, 1310:5, 1529:12 review [18] - 1294:1, 1294:8, 1307:24, 1314:16, 1318:7, 1320:7, 1320:16, 1321:9, 1322:9, 1334:10, 1351:24, 1356:6, 1356:10, 1373:24, 1375:5, 1436:6, 1436:15, 1487:1 reviewed [25] -1294:3, 1309:1, 1309:8. 1310:10. 1311:20, 1312:20, 1312:22, 1317:25, 1318:6, 1318:14, 1320:22, 1323:7, 1335:2, 1335:3, 1355:14, 1356:18, 1356:22, 1361:10, 1372:24, 1435:14, 1435:24, 1436:20, 1439:5, 1455:17, 1541:10 reviewing [7] -1309:4, 1329:7, 1355:10, 1361:5, 1454:23, 1457:22, 1493:5 revised [1] - 1475:3 Revolution [1] -1297:6 rewrite [3] - 1534:5, 1545:16, 1547:5 rewriting [3] -1473:21, 1547:9, 1553:19 Richard [1] - 1290:14 ridiculed [1] - 1497:13 right-hand [1] -1388:8 rights [5] - 1320:20, 1321:8, 1323:1, 1415:11, 1531:15 rights-holder's [1] -1415:11

Rimini [358] - 1293:18, 1294:3, 1294:10, 1294:13, 1294:15, 1294:18, 1296:24, 1297:5, 1301:20, 1302:25, 1304:22, 1323:22. 1324:2. 1324:10. 1324:12. 1324:14, 1324:15, 1324:19, 1324:22, 1327:2, 1327:5, 1327:9, 1327:13, 1327:19, 1328:2, 1328:15, 1328:23, 1329:1, 1329:15, 1329:19, 1331:7, 1331:9, 1333:7, 1333:18, 1334:25, 1335:4, 1335:5, 1335:8, 1335:14, 1336:9, 1345:11, 1345:14, 1345:23, 1347:23, 1348:19, 1350:5, 1351:4, 1351:7, 1353:9, 1353:19, 1353:23, 1353:25, 1354:17, 1354:21, 1355:8, 1355:9, 1355:11, 1355:24, 1356:14, 1356:17, 1356:22, 1356:25, 1363:5, 1365:14, 1374:16, 1374:18, 1375:3, 1375:19, 1375:23, 1376:13, 1376:19, 1377:2, 1377:11, 1377:20, 1379:10, 1380:21, 1381:11, 1382:3, 1385:20, 1386:7, 1386:25, 1387:12, 1388:2, 1388:9, 1392:2, 1395:6, 1398:15, 1398:19, 1399:19, 1405:16, 1410:19, 1410:23, 1411:8, 1432:18, 1433:23, 1434:9, 1434:19, 1435:5, 1435:19, 1438:23, 1438:24, 1439:10, 1439:19, 1441:4, 1442:1, 1442:6, 1442:11, 1442:19, 1443:2, 1443:10, 1443:19, 1444:1, 1444:3, 1444:7, 1444:11, 1444:21, 1445:1, 1448:16, 1448:23, 1448:24, 1449:21,

				37
1449:24, 1450:14,	1499:25, 1501:9,	1354:12, 1354:20,	1405:11, 1405:20,	1413:9, 1414:1,
1453:1, 1453:3,	1501:22, 1502:14,	1355:4, 1362:15,	1408:17, 1410:9,	1414:5, 1526:6
1454:9, 1462:23,	1502:16, 1502:23,	1372:21, 1374:6,	1411:9	rush [1] - 1549:18
1463:20, 1465:5,	1503:3, 1503:6,	1374:7, 1375:5,	rscmpay [6] -	Tusii[i] - 1349.10
1465:15, 1466:16,	1503:15, 1503:23,	1375:6, 1408:17,	1382:20, 1385:15,	S
1466:21, 1467:1,	1503:24, 1504:3,	1422:5, 1422:24,	1417:3, 1418:22,	3
1467:4, 1467:16,	1504:12, 1507:1,	1423:5, 1424:5,	1452:5, 1501:7	<b>S-35</b> [1] - 1413:5
1467:19, 1467:21,	1510:7, 1510:10,	1424:6, 1425:15,	rscmpay.cbl [1] -	<b>S-36</b> [1] - 1413:5
1467:22, 1468:4,	1510:13, 1510:14,	1444:25, 1466:12,	1414:25	<b>S-YT</b> [1] - 1393:21
1468:14, 1468:16,	1510:20, 1510:23,	1467:6, 1467:13,	rsi [3] - 1524:24,	<b>S-YTD</b> [8] - 1393:21,
1468:20, 1469:1,	1512:9, 1512:24,	1468:11, 1469:9,	1527:17	1394:16, 1400:12,
1469:7, 1469:8,	1513:9, 1514:4,	1470:4, 1473:24,	<b>RSI</b> [3] - 1501:2,	1459:18, 1460:3,
1469:15, 1469:19,	1514:7, 1514:8,	1475:3, 1477:10,	1501:3, 1524:14	1460:25, 1461:9,
1469:21, 1469:23,	1515:7, 1515:12,	1477:11, 1479:1,	<b>RSI-1099</b> [1] - 1407:9	1461:11
1469:24, 1470:2,	1515:16, 1515:22,	1480:17, 1483:9,	rsi1099i [2] - 1405:10,	<b>sake</b> [1] - 1361:22
1470:8, 1470:14,	1515:24, 1515:25,	1483:18, 1484:15,	1522:19	sale [3] - 1338:14,
1470:16, 1470:18,	1516:3, 1516:6,	1485:11, 1485:12,	RSI1099M [1] -	1338:16, 1340:2
1470:21, 1470:23,	1516:8, 1516:9,	1485:21, 1487:25,	1448:23	SalesForce [29] -
1471:3, 1471:6,	1516:23, 1519:5,	1488:20, 1500:25,	rsi1099m [2] -	1352:2, 1353:2,
1471:8, 1471:10,	1519:18, 1519:21,	1501:1, 1501:4,	1405:10, 1522:20	1353:11, 1354:24,
1471:16, 1471:18,	1520:16, 1520:17,	1501:8, 1501:24,	RSI2_013223831 [1] -	1355:8, 1355:20,
1471:21, 1472:1,	1521:20, 1522:2,	1503:22, 1506:24,	1441:25	1356:7, 1356:18,
1472:8, 1472:22,	1522:14, 1522:22,	1512:4, 1512:10,	RSI2_013352306 [1] -	1356:21, 1356:25,
1473:1, 1473:7,	1522:23, 1523:3,	1513:13, 1514:13,	1441:25	1357:7, 1357:12,
1473:10, 1473:16,	1523:4, 1524:6,	1518:24, 1519:11,	rsi940 [2] - 1501:3,	1436:9, 1436:11,
1474:1, 1474:4,	1524:8, 1525:7,	1525:12, 1529:10,	1527:17	1436:16, 1437:4,
1474:11, 1474:14,	1525:8, 1525:12,	1537:18, 1547:20	rsi960us [2] - 1365:11,	1437:21, 1438:6,
1474:16, 1474:18,	1525:15, 1525:22,	Rimini-created [2] -	1478:15	1438:8, 1439:1,
1474:22, 1474:23,	1526:7, 1527:10,	1448:23, 1507:1	rspcmpay [3] -	1439:9, 1439:12,
1475:2, 1475:13,	1527:16, 1527:17,	Rimini-written [4] -	1388:21, 1463:17,	1488:3, 1488:7,
1475:18, 1475:25,	1527:23, 1528:2,	1510:13, 1512:9,	1496:14	1489:22, 1490:11,
1476:2, 1476:14,	1528:22, 1529:2,	1525:7, 1535:7	rspcmpay.cbl [4] -	1490:14, 1545:9,
1476:18, 1476:23,	1529:16, 1532:11,	ris940a [1] - 1519:10	1375:15, 1379:11,	1547:19
1476:24, 1478:3,	1533:3, 1533:13,	Rockefeller [5] -	1387:12, 1452:20	<b>Samplin</b> [1] - 1290:20
1478:8, 1478:19,	1533:25, 1534:6,	1499:15, 1499:16,	rule [3] - 1295:13,	<b>Samuel</b> [1] - 1290:20
1478:23, 1479:4,	1534:16, 1535:7,	1524:22, 1525:17,	1416:3, 1466:23	<b>SAP's</b> [1] - 1441:20
1479:15, 1480:5,	1535:21, 1536:6,	1551:10	Rule [3] - 1440:14,	<b>sat</b> [1] - 1294:5
1480:7, 1480:16,	1537:10, 1538:12,	Rockefeller's [1] -	1440:22, 1442:21	<b>saw</b> [24] - 1344:3,
1480:22, 1481:2,	1539:3, 1539:12,	1525:16	ruled [6] - 1444:7,	1357:8, 1430:10,
1481:7, 1481:9,	1539:21, 1540:12,	role [3] - 1415:14,	1471:15, 1503:14,	1431:16, 1434:25,
1481:12, 1481:22,	1540:19, 1541:2,	1437:10, 1479:5	1503:20, 1513:9,	1437:9, 1479:16,
1482:1, 1482:5, 1482:10, 1482:17,	1541:5, 1541:23, 1542:3, 1542:9,	roll [1] - 1369:13	1522:13	1489:25, 1490:8,
1482:10, 1482:17, 1483:11, 1483:12,	1542.3, 1542.9, 1543:6, 1543:19,	room [1] - 1316:1	ruling [6] - 1348:22,	1490:9, 1498:6,
1483:15, 1483:16,	1543:25, 1544:25,	roughly [4] - 1383:2,	1443:8, 1476:7,	1502:23, 1507:2,
1483:17, 1483:19,	1546:12, 1546:15,	1431:21, 1432:20,	1487:8, 1543:23,	1509:12, 1515:16,
1483:22, 1484:7,	1547:11, 1547:18,	1533:8	1550:5	1517:20, 1517:25,
1484:18, 1486:6,	1550:2, 1551:2,	route [1] - 1317:12	rulings [2] - 1491:18,	1520:20, 1525:4, 1525:14, 1528:5
1486:10, 1486:15,	1551:11, 1551:20,	routine [3] - 1402:4,	1512:21	1525:14, 1528:5, 1541:6, 1543:10
1487:4, 1487:6,	1552:10, 1552:16,	1462:17, 1505:5	run [16] - 1354:1,	1541:6, 1543:10
1488:7, 1488:8,	1553:1, 1553:3,	row [2] - 1426:16,	1403:24, 1407:11,	scanning [4] - 1505:5,
1489:2, 1489:3,	1553:9, 1553:18,	1430:16	1408:11, 1410:6,	1541:13, 1541:18, 1545:5
1489:7, 1489:14,	1553:20, 1553:24,	rows [12] - 1426:18, 1426:24, 1427:1,	1412:3, 1413:12,	scenario [1] - 1451:10
1491:24, 1492:25,	1555:7	1426.24, 1427.1, 1427:2, 1427:5,	1425:15, 1511:13,	Schedule [3] -
1494:4, 1494:5,	<b>RIMINI</b> [1] - 1290:7	1427.2, 1427.5, 1427:12, 1427:15,	1512:3, 1512:7,	1492:22, 1519:8,
1494:12, 1494:16,	Rimini's [65] - 1296:2,	1427.12, 1427.13, 1428:2, 1429:11,	1524:12, 1524:18,	1492.22, 1519.6, 1526:19
1495:16, 1495:19,	1303:25, 1324:13,	1429:13, 1429:24	1534:21, 1551:13	schedule [1] - 1556:3
1495:21, 1495:23,	1327:24, 1334:8,	RPG [1] - 1316:8	running [3] - 1325:9,	scheduling [1] -
1495:25, 1498:10,	1334:14, 1334:19,	RS18F07 [7] -	1354:6, 1511:23	1403:15
1498:16, 1498:17,	1334:23, 1335:16,	1404:19, 1404:22,	runs [7] - 1307:5,	science [5] - 1416:6,
1499:6, 1499:10,	1336:12, 1350:21,	,	1413:3, 1413:8,	

1351:9, 1351:13,

1456:1

1470:14, 1482:24,

1519:16, 1525:11,

1398:13, 1455:6,

1455:25, 1515:12 State [1] - 1514:1 state [4] - 1292:15, 1345:17, 1410:18, 1425:17 statement [42] -1319:12, 1336:15, 1388:13, 1391:5, 1391:12, 1391:13, 1391:19, 1392:10, 1392:12, 1392:23, 1392:24, 1395:18, 1395:20, 1398:23, 1398:24, 1406:7, 1406:13, 1406:17, 1410:13, 1416:14, 1419:23, 1420:5, 1426:1, 1433:21, 1434:3, 1435:1, 1435:10, 1435:12, 1437:18, 1456:15, 1456:18, 1456:24, 1456:25, 1457:1, 1461:4, 1468:20, 1471:10, 1472:12, 1500:20, 1519:2 STATEMENT[2] -1391:13, 1457:5 statements [17] -1318:2, 1384:10, 1384:11, 1384:13, 1384:19, 1386:18, 1386:19, 1386:20, 1406:6, 1406:8, 1407:3, 1407:9, 1425:14, 1453:24, 1453:25, 1486:11, 1554:9 STATES[1] - 1290:1 states [2] - 1359:8, 1445:12 States [2] - 1514:2, 1519:25 stating [1] - 1388:14 Statistics [1] - 1536:5 **statutory** [1] - 1543:14 Stava [7] - 1318:22, 1319:13, 1319:15, 1320:5, 1336:15, 1336:21, 1349:12 Stava's [4] - 1318:4, 1318:14, 1318:25, 1321:20 stay [2] - 1326:24, 1484:17 stayed [1] - 1533:8 step [4] - 1326:3, 1373:21, 1452:7,

1524:24

STEPHEN [1] -

1291:17 Stephen [3] - 1441:3, 1500:16, 1560:4 steps [11] - 1375:24, 1379:6, 1459:21, 1469:16, 1470:15, 1524:23, 1525:6, 1541:2, 1551:7, 1552:3, 1552:4 stick [1] - 1380:18 stifle [1] - 1389:20 still [11] - 1317:1, 1318:24, 1361:13, 1369:11, 1369:15, 1413:6, 1463:19, 1463:20, 1463:21, 1489:17, 1521:12 stipulated [2] -1474:6, 1474:10 stmt [1] - 1392:25 **STMT**[7] - 1395:9, 1395:17, 1416:13, 1456:12, 1457:2, 1457:5, 1458:21 stood [2] - 1545:20, 1546:2 **stop** [4] - 1368:14, 1540:12, 1545:4, 1553:5 stopped [1] - 1470:10 **stops** [1] - 1325:12 store [4] - 1414:7, 1414:10, 1414:12, 1414:17 stored [1] - 1414:15 stores [1] - 1506:25 stories [1] - 1486:6 storing [1] - 1498:15 story [2] - 1533:20, 1541:17 straight [4] - 1391:10, 1492:25, 1539:4, 1539:20 straightforward [2] -1482:21, 1551:14 strategically [1] -1303:11 strategy [2] - 1292:19, 1502:12 STREET [1] - 1290:7 Street [24] - 1290:24, 1324:3, 1324:12, 1345:11, 1345:14, 1345:23, 1441:5, 1469:23, 1469:24, 1473:7, 1473:10, 1475:18, 1480:16, 1480:22, 1481:2, 1481:7, 1494:12, 1495:21, 1495:25,

1499:7, 1499:10, 1534:6, 1537:10, 1551.2 Street's [3] - 1324:10, 1473:1, 1473:16 stressed [1] - 1407:8 stricken [1] - 1345:18 strike [3] - 1376:16, 1402:12, 1423:24 striking [4] - 1475:16, 1475:22, 1516:10, 1516:11 string [1] - 1417:19 strongest [1] - 1485:7 strongly [1] - 1371:10 struck [3] - 1304:20, 1367:8, 1538:4 structure [4] -1394:16, 1458:9, 1509:2, 1509:5 structures [2] -1373:4, 1507:1 **struggle** [1] - 1370:9 struggling [2] -1368:1, 1369:15 stuff [1] - 1485:14 style [1] - 1382:5 Sub [1] - 1546:21 subject [4] - 1350:5, 1375:13, 1400:8, 1412:22 submission [1] -1443:5 submit [2] - 1500:23, 1554:12 submitted [4] -1465:8, 1473:2, 1554:25, 1556:16 subprogram [1] -1390:15 subroutine [8] -1390:25, 1391:2, 1395:19, 1401:25, 1418:23, 1419:6, 1419:18, 1419:20 subscribes [1] -1303:4 subsequent [1] -1360:20 subsequently [1] -1362:11 substantial [22] -1376:18, 1388:1, 1393:14, 1394:6, 1453:5, 1453:9, 1473:25, 1477:12, 1485:8, 1488:1, 1501:23, 1502:5, 1512:11, 1523:12, 1535:22, 1536:1,

1540:8, 1543:25, 1544:21, 1551:21, 1552:18 substantially [18] -1395:24, 1396:19, 1462:23, 1469:9, 1501:6. 1510:2. 1510:4. 1510:12. 1510:25, 1513:14, 1513:20, 1519:16, 1523:21, 1525:11, 1527:22, 1535:15, 1540:2, 1549:23 successful [1] -1337:7 sudden [1] - 1325:12 suddenly [1] -1532:19 sufficient [2] - 1324:6, 1468:22 suggest [3] - 1520:14, 1532:25, 1556:24 suggested [1] -1402:15 suggesting [2] -1299:4, 1300:22 suggestion [1] -1442:13 Suite [1] - 1338:4 Suites [4] - 1297:15, 1343:4, 1343:8, 1343:15 summaries [3] -1436:9, 1437:4, 1437:21 summarize [2] -1370:11, 1487:22 summarized [1] -1472:19 summarizes [1] -1490:19 summarizing [1] -1554:6 **summary** [22] -1293:14, 1314:3, 1323:11, 1473:3, 1473:4, 1473:17, 1476:1, 1476:6, 1481:18, 1482:13, 1482:22, 1487:8, 1491:24, 1492:13, 1512:23, 1540:18, 1541:4, 1546:20, 1546:25, 1547:2, 1550:2, 1550:5 summer [3] - 1558:1, 1558:13 super [1] - 1413:13 superfluous [6] -1330:5, 1331:12,

**TO** [1] - 1460:25 1393:17, 1395:24, 1465:14, 1466:15, 1421:11, 1444:24, 1328:6, 1330:17, 1467:19, 1471:17, 1446:7, 1538:17 today [24] - 1291:9, 1396:18, 1396:20, 1384:20, 1387:23, 1325:16, 1337:7, 1396:21, 1410:13, 1472:19, 1473:5, trying [22] - 1303:7, 1392:12, 1414:15, 1371:5, 1379:3, 1426:20, 1430:16, 1473:6, 1474:2, 1310:19, 1326:1, 1447:1, 1447:22, 1403:6, 1403:18, 1454:5, 1458:5, 1474:5, 1474:8, 1326:12, 1366:9, 1448:1, 1507:9, 1404:7, 1425:21, 1469:21, 1471:23 1474:23, 1481:15, 1366:19, 1366:20, 1547:17, 1548:10 1430:12, 1430:22, topic [2] - 1418:14, 1481:24, 1483:10, 1367:16. 1369:16. typed [4] - 1409:15, 1443:16 1483:14, 1483:21, 1389:21. 1436:18. 1409:22, 1516:21, 1430:23, 1430:24, 1441:3, 1453:14, 1483:24, 1484:3, 1465:22, 1470:23, 1551:3 total [1] - 1463:2 1502:18, 1544:8, 1489:15, 1510:7, types [22] - 1293:14, 1465:12, 1471:3, totally [3] - 1534:12, 1488:22, 1492:11, 1557:9, 1557:12 1546:11, 1548:10, 1515:12, 1538:5, 1293:18, 1294:10, 1552:9, 1553:21, 1495:13, 1508:15, touch [7] - 1328:22, 1547:5, 1549:16, 1294:12, 1294:15, 1554:7, 1555:6, 1512:22, 1547:25, 1555:15, 1555:16, 1297:4, 1317:10, 1441:5, 1448:21, 1552:13 1555:25, 1556:6, 1557:6 1326:16, 1326:23, 1486:8, 1501:17, 1556:8, 1556:10, TUESDAY[1] - 1403:1 together [4] - 1315:12, 1333:16, 1352:7, 1540:8, 1544:9 1556:12, 1557:23, Tuesday [2] - 1291:7, 1352:11, 1352:19, 1357:18, 1417:20, touched [1] - 1546:17 1558:19 1436:5 1383:14, 1431:5, towards [3] - 1340:12, 1554:15 trials [6] - 1472:23, Tom [2] - 1355:2, turn [11] - 1364:15, 1432:7, 1432:9, 1471:21, 1558:1 1432:21, 1448:13, 1555:15, 1555:17, 1355:3 track [2] - 1341:12, 1399:21, 1454:3, 1556:6, 1557:24, 1475:20, 1506:23, tomorrow [1] -1506:14, 1509:21, 1465:11 1558:10 1519:7, 1524:10, 1509:13 1403:22 training [1] - 1505:5 tried [10] - 1368:7, tons [1] - 1525:7 1524:21, 1526:18, typical [1] - 1489:6 transaction [1] took [12] - 1368:23, 1446:22, 1494:1, 1527:25, 1544:6 typically [3] - 1399:5, 1433:4 1495:3, 1496:5, turned [4] - 1481:17, 1399:6, 1414:19 1467:19, 1469:16, TRANSCRIPT[1] -1469:24, 1470:14, 1516:16, 1520:14, 1496:9, 1504:14, 1290:11 1521:25, 1522:10, 1524:10 U 1474:2, 1489:13, transcript [11] -1532:25 1496:6. 1517:1. twice [1] - 1420:12 1301:10, 1301:13, ultimately [5] troubleshoot [6] -1541:2, 1549:2, two [54] - 1307:13, 1306:16, 1349:23, 1363:16, 1366:17, 1347:10, 1421:15, 1549:9 1307:16, 1330:12, 1353:16, 1372:10, tool [6] - 1294:24, 1366:24, 1370:24, 1363:3, 1366:18, 1479:25, 1495:7, 1381:3, 1381:4, 1445:2, 1448:5 1521:15 1295:12, 1295:14, 1368:6, 1371:22, 1423:11, 1434:3, troubleshooting [5] unable [1] - 1469:17 1295:17, 1400:6, 1379:17, 1382:4, 1559:6 unacceptable [1] -1362:7, 1450:22, 1507.6 1382:8, 1382:19, transcripts [2] -1467:25, 1477:20, 1326:14 tools [50] - 1294:25, 1386:6, 1387:6, 1465:3, 1465:5 1495:22 unaccounted [1] -1389:4, 1397:5, 1295:7, 1295:8, Transfer [1] - 1372:20 truck [1] - 1317:9 1398:7, 1408:22, 1432:17 1295:23, 1296:2, transfer [2] - 1358:19, 1296:14, 1296:17, Trucking [7] -1418:3, 1421:6, unaddressed [1] -1374:5 1358:25, 1371:23, 1541:22 1296:18, 1296:19, 1428:7, 1430:20, transferred [2] uncommon [1] -1374:11, 1374:18, 1431:15, 1431:16, 1296:21, 1296:25, 1449:23, 1449:25 1490:18, 1495:1, 1397:16 1432:13, 1432:24, 1297:2, 1297:12, transferring[1] -1527:3 1438:16, 1449:6, unconstrained [3] -1297:15, 1297:17, 1449:13 TRUE [1] - 1460:25 1450:7, 1452:23, 1380:15, 1380:16, 1297:20, 1297:24, transform [1] true [20] - 1304:14, 1456:7, 1457:10, 1507:23 1298:17, 1298:23, 1510:23 1299:9, 1299:11, 1383:10, 1384:7, 1463:2, 1470:10, uncovered [1] translating [1] -1401:15, 1401:17, 1488:24, 1490:11, 1313:18, 1314:7, 1553:3 1438:6 1490:14, 1495:17, 1314:14, 1314:17, 1406:14, 1410:25, undefined [1] - 1472:2 transmitted [1] -1498:8, 1503:12, 1314:19, 1314:25, 1413:18, 1416:8, under [21] - 1318:2, 1352:1 1509:4, 1511:19, 1315:4, 1324:19, 1416:12, 1432:25, 1340:8, 1341:9, transparent [1] -1408:9, 1408:12, 1461:6, 1461:12, 1513:24, 1515:21, 1346:7, 1365:20, 1557:12 1522:19, 1528:1, 1408:18, 1408:19, 1463:21, 1463:22, 1371:2, 1383:2, transparently [1] -1528:6, 1533:8, 1409:19, 1410:24, 1504:15, 1504:18, 1424:12, 1442:14, 1485:4 1411:8, 1411:11, 1504:23, 1505:1, 1540:11, 1540:12, 1442:21, 1450:19, transposed [4] -1441:15, 1441:17, 1505:2 1541:16, 1545:9, 1507:15, 1509:16, 1424:14, 1424:16, 1470:10, 1476:25, truly [1] - 1517:24 1545:12 1514:7, 1526:3, 1424:17, 1424:19 1487:5, 1492:11, trust [1] - 1429:19 **Two** [1] - 1490:16 1528:25, 1530:14, travel [1] - 1403:15 two-thirds [1] -1498:20, 1501:12, trusted [1] - 1298:6 1543:6, 1546:21, treatment [1] -1507:8, 1531:20, 1457:10 truth [2] - 1442:17, 1555:19, 1556:1 1304:22 1532:16, 1540:12 txt [3] - 1351:25, 1502:4 underlie [1] - 1509:23 trial [43] - 1291:8, top [15] - 1381:6, 1352:1, 1428:10 try [9] - 1325:22, underlying [4] -1340:23, 1340:24, 1381:22, 1382:1, type [13] - 1327:16, 1368:3, 1370:8, 1369:16, 1406:23, 1423:11, 1464:22,

47